The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXXV NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JULY 4, 1923 NUMBER 448

Contents

The Week 134
Editorials
The Pro-Germanism of the British..... 138
Are Miners People?..... 139
The Confiscation Bugaboo..... 140
General Articles
The Rail Leaders Think.....John W. Owens 142
Mr. Kahn Would Like to Know.....
.....Walter Lippmann 144
Meiklejohn of Amherst....Robert Morss Lovett 146
Why the Mark Sank...Ernest Minor Patterson 148
The Dilemma of Marriage.....Alyse Gregory 151
Russia—1923, III.....Fridtjof Nansen 152
Correspondence 154
Five Poems by Siegfried Sassoon..... 156
Reviews of Books
The Harvard Dead.....R. M. L. 157
The Two-Dollar Novel.....Glenway Wescott 158
Canada's Constitution.....Harold J. Laski 159
Shakespeare.....Samuel C. Chew 160
The Hundred and One Harlequins.....
.....Gorham B. Munson 160

The Week

ACCUMULATING EVIDENCE of the heavy cost of the Ruhr occupation to both France and Germany is the one factor in the situation which, as we go to press, offers any hope of an early solution. Poincaré's long delay in replying to the Curzon proposal and its accompanying questionnaire, a delay for which the disorganized state of the Belgian government is only a pretext, is doubtless based on the hope that Germany cannot hold out much longer, while the French people will remain docile under their burdens for some time to come. General Degoutte announces the confiscation of all the Ruhr industries engaged in making reparation goods; and forbids the movement of coal on which the forty percent tax has not been paid. In Germany itself the gyrations of the mark hold the centre of the stage, and have resulted in a widespread demand that workers be paid in dollars or some other stationary medium. Anglo-French relations have been disturbed by the publication in the London Observer of an alleged official French document acknowledging responsibility for the abortive Dorten rebellion. To this the French papers reply with the rather lame charge that the British and the Germans are also conspiring to produce a fictitious Rhineland republic, ostensibly independent, but really faithful to the Reich.

THE MOSUL OIL DISPUTE, Bulgaria's renewed demand for an outlet on the Aegean, the proposed new military code for aircraft and radio, and the misbehavior of Mt. Aetna are the other outstanding developments of the week's foreign news. Turkey and Great Britain will seek a private settlement of the Mosul matter, and if they have not succeeded within nine months, will refer the question to that repository for unsolved riddles, the League of Nations. Trotsky, who is rapidly achieving a reputation as the Admiral Sims of Russia, is the author of an inflammatory speech demanding revenge on Great Britain and hinting at a rapprochement with France. The League of Nations Commission in control of the Saar has withdrawn its outrageous decree of March 7th; and the League itself announces a pan-European conference to extend the principles of the Pacific pact signed at the Washington Conference. In answer to Lord Robert Cecil's plan for continental guarantees of peace the French propose a substitute which would permit them to continue their domination of the Little Entente. Mt. Aetna has put Mussolini's nose completely out of joint by spouting even more fiery stuff than his.

PRESIDENT HARDING'S TOUR, international prohibition complications and the release of part of the political prisoners have been the outstanding incidents of the week in the domestic field. The President has announced his virtual abandonment of the World Court, by insisting that America cannot join it unless it is completely divorced from the League. He reaffirms his faith in the railway consolidation plan, and points with pride to a probable surplus of $200,000,000 in next year's federal budget. To this the Democrats make the unkind reply that the alleged surplus will only result from the fact that the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

preliminary estimate of the government's income was $800,000,000 too small. Simultaneously with the President's speech announcing that his administration has rescued agriculture and that any farmer who goes on being poor is exhibiting extraordinary stubbornness, comes the announcement by Bernard M. Baruch of a plan for cooperative farmer ownership of some big wholesale grain house such as Armour and Company. By way of ironic comment on the President's tour, an election in Michigan gives a Republican victory by 385 votes in a district which produced a lead for the party of 8,000 in 1922 and 31,000 in 1920.

THE PROHIBITION QUESTION, as usual, secured more newspaper space this week than any other subject. The seizure of liquor under seal on British liners in New York harbor, while it is consistent with the recent rulings of the Treasury Department, is well calculated to raise to the boiling point the wrath of other nations already irritated by what they regard as our incomprehensible interference with their citizens. A reflection of this point of view is found in Canada's refusal to withhold clearance papers from rum-running vessels bound for the United States. While tempers are shortened by a nation-wide heat wave of unusual ferocity, the singularly inappropriate news is made public that another strike of the anthracite miners is threatened. Attorney-General Daugherty has heard that American and British coal miners have an agreement whereby the latter will refuse to dig coal for the American market, in the event that the former stop work. If this should be done, says Mr. Daugherty, he will take "prompt and vigorous" action. No doubt this means the issuance of an international injunction against the British miners, a new device in foreign relations. A series of failures among important Wall Street firms resulted in a panicky stock market, which has been bolstered up, rumor says, through the heroism of the big bankers, who have gone into the market and bought. Additional evidence that the trend of business in general is no longer upward is found in the news that wholesale prices went down two percent in May.

DELAYS IN FORMING a new cabinet at Brussels fall in very conveniently for M. Poincaré's plans. It is not necessary for France to reply to the British questionnaire on the latest German offer until Belgium has a cabinet that can be consulted. In the meantime, France keeps her grip on Germany's throat and listens hopefully for the death rattle. Probably Premier Baldwin is coming to the conclusion that the questionnaire method is not so clever as he thought it was. A plain statement of British policy might have raised an unpleasant outcry in Paris, but it would have brought a definite solution nearer. The time that has elapsed since the questionnaire was drawn up has been lost. And there is not much time to lose if the German nation is to be saved from a grave political crisis.

MR. ELIOT WADSWORTH, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in his address at the luncheon of the Harvard Alumni Association spoke soft things to those that sit at ease in Zion. He assured them that we could do nothing at present internationally, and that our pleasant duty was to minister to our own prosperity "building up a force which has (sic) and will prove of untold benefit in the reestablishment of Europe." We should like to ask Mr. Wadsworth three questions. Did the United States assume any responsibility when it lent the force which is now being used to reduce Europe to chaos? Did the United States assume any responsibility when it wrote into the pre-armistice agreement the Fourteen Points as a basis of peace? Did it assume any responsibility when its representatives at Paris drew up for Germany's signature the Treaty of Versailles, with provisions intended to prevent the further invasion and dismemberment of that country? If our government does not recognize these responsibilities let it say so frankly and cynically: the Germans were fools to disarm on the pre-armistice agreement, and fools to sign at Versailles. If it does recognize them but sees no way of fulfilling them because France has said she would let us speak only in terms of war or cash, let it say that. Only let us have done with the sickening complacence that permits Mr. Wadsworth and his kind to speak of enjoying, as a kind of special privilege, the most humiliating position to which our country has ever sunk.

WITH THE RETURN of the American delegates from the meeting of the Advisory Committee on Opium of the League of Nations it becomes possible to make a more accurate appraisal of the results of their efforts than was possible on the basis of the cabled reports. While no honest foe of the drug traffic can be satisfied with the achievements of the Committee it must be recorded that two definite victories were attained which justify the hope that in a comparatively few years this monstrous evil may be a thing of the past. The powers represented at Geneva accepted the all-important American declaration that the Opium Convention of 1912 was intended to limit the production of this drug to the actual world needs for medicinal and scientific purposes. This position will not be lived up to in the immediate future; but if the League of Nations itself survives, there can ultimately be no escape from this commitment. The reservation made by France, Germany, Great Britain, Japan, the Netherlands, Portugal and Siam declares that "the use of prepared opium and the production, export and import of raw opium for that purpose is legitimate so long as that use is subject to and in accordance with the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

provisions of Chapter II of the Convention." While this reservation is to be regretted, it does bind these powers to a gradual curtailment of opium smoking, with a corresponding reduction of imports and exports until the non-medicinal and non-scientific use of the drug has been abolished.

THE MOST SERIOUS INFRINGEMENT of the American desires is found in the reservation by India to the effect that the eating of opium by natives in districts where physicians are not readily available shall be regarded as semi-medical and therefore not illegitimate under the meaning of the Convention of 1912. In extenuation of this position the ingenious theory was advanced that eating opium is the least deleterious method of introducing it into the system; that through generations of such indulgence the natives of some parts of India have developed a special immunity; that the Indian climate requires stimulants of some sort and that opium-eating is the native equivalent for the consumption of alcoholic beverages by the white man. On the right side of the ledger must be recorded the fact that this position, taken by the representative of the Indian government (a Scotchman, incidentally), was in no way supported by the British government itself. It is also reported that the Indian government is preparing in the near future to ask the native members of the Indian Legislature to take into their own hands the problem of gradual reduction of both the poppy acreage and the use of the drug. By the group of anti-opium crusaders which uses the Indian traffic only as an excuse for attack upon the British empire and to aid the cause of the Indian revolutionists, this suggestion will, of course, be received with loud shouts of scorn. Nevertheless, it does offer some hope of amelioration for a situation so dreadful that any degree of abatement is welcome.

THE DECISION of the American Relief Administration to discontinue its work in Russia July 15th is an occasion for the eloquent congratulation of all concerned. But in the orgy of self-satisfaction with which the American people brings to a conclusion the greatest relief work of the ages it is pertinent, though unpleasant, to inquire: What of the children who have been so far saved by American aid? According to a statement received through Dr. Nansen's office, there are 4,000,000 abandoned or orphaned children in Russia and 1,500,000 additional hungry ones. Of these, 1,250,000 are in institutions, 900,000 receive food relief from the Central Famine Committee, and 1,700,000 from foreign organizations. 1,500,000 are receiving no relief.

EVEN if the optimistic forecasts of the harvest are realized this new plenty will not meet the needs of the smaller children, who must be provided with other food than coarse rye bread. A letter from Madam Kamenev, wife of the Acting Premier, defines the situation:

> In connection with the liquidation of these foreign relief organizations, we are faced with the necessity of finding, with the utmost urgency, some method of so regulating the diet of these children that the sudden cessation of the foreign feeding will not mean the death of many of them before they can be accustomed to the coarse food which will, alone, be available in Russia. We must also decide the important question of what is to become of the orphaned and abandoned children who have hitherto been fed in children's homes by foreign relief agencies.
>
> We may assume that the children who have relatives will, somehow, be cared for by their families; but there appears to be no means of caring for the orphaned children in the children's homes except through state support. It is quite clear also that the number of these homes will have to be increased, as those who are utterly unable to care for their children will unquestionably abandon them to the children's homes, and also numbers of children now wandering about with no care at all will have to be housed and cared for in order to solve the important problem of child criminality.
>
> We are therefore compelled, now, to face the problem before us and to make up our minds how it is to be met.

Madam Kamenev puts this matter before the American-Nansen Committee for Relief of Russian Children, I Madison Avenue, New York City, and asks its continued help to cope with the problem of the more than 3,000,000 helpless children of Russia who, on July 15th, will face death—if not immediately, certainly during the coming winter.

HAS PRESIDENT HARDING decided to abandon his efforts to bring the United States into the International Court of Justice? It is difficult to put any other interpretation upon his St. Louis speech, in which he demands that the Court be made completely independent of the League of Nations and self-perpetuating, the judges themselves electing the men who are to fill vacancies in their own ranks. These proposals are widely at variance with his previous pronouncements on the subject. If they are designed to mollify the irreconcilables, they will do no such thing; the irreconcilables are a battalion of death who pretend to oppose this court only because they want no court at all. To try to meet their objections is to pour water into a sieve. The President takes it for granted that the anxiety of the rest of the world to secure America's cooperation is so great that anything we ask will be granted. In this he is probably in error. Most of the European nations would like to see America in the League, and would accept drastic alterations in the Covenant to bring this about. No such condition exists, however, in regard to our adherence to the Permanent Court. The Europeans are not such fools as to imagine that Mr. Harding, or any Republican President who might succeed him, would make the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

World Court a back door for entrance into the League. Assuredly they will not go to any great pains to meet such a set of childishly nationalistic reservations as the President now proposes.

IN OUR JUDGMENT, President Harding is perfectly aware of this, and is indifferent to it. He has had no spontaneous affection for the World Court. His proposal that we adhere to it came as the result of long urging by American friends of international cooperation, and probably only then because he saw in it a device by which he might escape from the dilemma of his own pre-election promises, and those of others on his behalf, that under his leadership the United States would join some sort of association of nations. The President is a good-hearted, upright man. He is willing to fulfill his pledges if this can be done without too much trouble to himself. Unhappily for the country, the latter condition has not been met. The President is reported to have been astounded at the bitterness and strength of the opposition to his proposal among important members of his own party. If sticking to his World Court means that the Republican party is to be split wide open on the eve of the campaign, no one can doubt what he will do. Weeks ago he declared that he did not intend to fight for the World Court; that he would explain its merits to the country and let the country act as it thought best. But every practical politician knows that such a course on the part of the Chief Executive constitutes virtual abandonment. The President has left his baby on the country's doorstep, rung the bell and run away. He follows the technical rules of proper procedure though he knows very well that there is nobody home.

THE ACT OF AMNESTY by which President Harding released twenty-seven political prisoners serving sentence under war-time laws will be received with satisfaction tempered with indignation. What two years ago would have been a bold and generous declaration of good will appears now as a delayed, grudging and rather cowardly measure of reparation. The President has bowed for two years to the truculence of the American Legion and the malevolence of his Attorney General. Now that public opinion under the energetic spurring of Senator Pepper has become enlisted in sufficient force on the other side, the President does what he confessed he should have done and wanted to do two years ago. Meantime the campaign to accomplish in the United States what took place automatically in other countries has occupied the time, energy and money of public-spirited people which would certainly have gone into other and constructive forms of public service. The New York Tribune entitles its editorial on the amnesty, An Act of Justice. If it is an act of justice today it was so two years ago. Senator Pepper's report, which the Tribune mentions with respect, was anticipated in the case of the Chicago I. W. W.'s by that of Captain Lanier, the representative of the United States Army at the trial, in an open letter to President Wilson shortly after the conviction. And finally our enthusiasm is chastened by the reflection that there are still twenty-four political prisoners at Atlanta. The campaign must go on.

PRESIDENT HARDING'S address at St. Louis, in which he virtually abandoned the World Court as a practical enterprise, was broadcasted by radio, so that more people heard his words simultaneously than on any previous occasion in the history of human speech. Which reminds us of John Ruskin's remark on the opening of the cable between Great Britain and India:

> Is India the better for what you said to her? Are you the better for what she replied? If not, you have only wasted an all-around-the-world's length of copper wire—which is, indeed, about the sum of your doing. If you had had, perchance, two words of common sense to say, though you had taken wearisome time and trouble to send them—the two words of common sense would have been worth the carriage, and more. But you have not anything like so much as this to say either to India, or to any other place.

AS WE GO TO PRESS, the ballots in the New Republic's straw vote for liberals are just beginning to reach the office in sufficient numbers to make tabulation possible. These early returns will, of course, be subject to correction when a larger proportion of votes from the Middle West and Far West have been received. At present, the Presidential choices do not indicate that Henry Ford is as popular among liberals as some people have supposed. He is third on the list of possible candidates for a new party, La Follette being the first choice with 135 votes, Borah second with 105, and Ford third with 42. As a candidate of one of the existing parties, Ford comes fourth. McAdoo heads the list with 105 votes, Borah is second with 73, and La Follette has 69. Ford comes fourth with 42, and Al Smith next with 40. No great difference in the candidates' popularity in various parts of the country is yet discernible. In the East La Follette received 82 third party votes, Borah 59 and Ford 23. In the Middle West the early returns give La Follette 38, Borah 27 and Ford 13. A large number of other candidates receive a few votes each. That liberal opinion is strongly in favor of a third party is indicated by 347 votes to this effect, and only 86 in opposition.

THE SENTIMENT of the liberals thus far canvassed is only slightly in favor of the League of Nations, 234 voting to join and 215 declaring their opposition. Of the former number, 117 favor entering with reservations and 117 without. At the same

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time, a decline in the prestige of the League since 1920 is to be noted, 272 expressing themselves as being less sympathetic than in 1920, and only 111 as more so. The League appears slightly more popular in the East than in the Middle West, with 147 favorable votes to 129 unfavorable in the former region, and the Middle West almost equally divided in the early returns, 54 being for and 61 against. The other two questions in the straw vote, as to public ownership of mines and railroads, show an overwhelming majority favorable to both propositions, 383 voting yes on mines, and 68 no, and 358 favoring public ownership of railroads with 85 opposed.

EVEN THUS EARLY in the tabulating of returns, the great importance and interest of the straw vote are apparent. Through this questionnaire it becomes possible for the first time to discover the actual wishes of an important section of American opinion on specific points and regardless of its technical party affiliations. For that reason The New Republic in the strongest possible terms again urges its readers to fill out and return the ballot without delay. We also suggest that you call this enterprise to the attention of those of your friends who may properly be designated as liberals. The New Republic will be glad to send additional copies of the questionnaire upon request to be distributed in this way. To avoid the possibility of unrepresentative replies you are urged, however, not to ask for additional copies in numbers larger than you feel you can readily distribute.

The Pro-Germanism of the British

THAT fraction of our population which is still engaged in fighting the war must regard the present temper of the British people with astonishment and bitterness. For the British are undeniably pro-German, as our "pro-Allies" define the term. The British refuse to accept the legality or the political expediency of the French adventure. They have no stomach for the industrial ruin or the political dismemberment of Germany. They admit that the indemnity as it stands defeats its own financial purpose, and they press for a revision that will place it on a business basis. Unlike the blood-and-thunder Anglophiles on this side of the ocean, the British dismiss with contempt the spawn of Munchausen who proclaim that the Germans are prosperous, fat and happy and have deliberately wrecked their currency and their national finances in order to trick the Allies out of their indemnity rights. And what is perhaps even a more serious indictment, the British are proving faithless to the priceless heritage of war propaganda. They shrug their shoulders when you speak of Huns. When you set forth your proof that all the Germans, down to the unborn babes, shared in the responsibility for the war and should be made to suffer for it until they show real repentance, the Briton eyes you with cool disdain. It is almost enough to turn a red-blooded Anglophile into a pro-American.

If it were merely the present government of England that was, according to our current phrase, "playing the German game," our frothing Catos might set out to drive a wedge between the British government and the British people. But Baldwin and Curzon are leading the most irreconcilable party in England. The Asquith and Lloyd George liberals are far more inclined to accord Germany the right to live; still more is the Labor party. There is, in short, no respectable party or group in English politics that would meet the test of orthodoxy our own German haters would set. Any shift in British internal politics would make England more pro-German instead of less.

How can it be that the flame of hatred of Germany is dying down in England, while it still blazes brilliantly in America? Had we the greater grievances? Certainly not. It was England, not America, that was menaced before the war by German industrial and commercial expansion. The German naval policy was directed against British sea power. German diplomacy in the Levant was aimed at the British Empire. England was the inspiration of the German hymns of hate. What German poet ever tried to rhyme up "Gott strafe die Vereinigten Staaten?" Through four years every Englishman's waking hours were filled with anxiety over the submarine menace, and his sleep was disturbed by dreams of bombs from the air. Almost every household had to mourn a son, or brother, or father slain in the field. And yet today England stands out as the one bulwark of German national existence. When Germany gets on her feet again she will have England and no other power to thank for her salvation.

There are a number of explanations current for this strange difference between the British and the American pro-British attitude. One is that the Englishman is by instinct and training a good sportsman. He batters his antagonist manfully, and offers a cordial hand when the bout is over. True, but we Americans are also equipped with the ideals of good sportmanship, and have given a number of notable instances of our attachment to those ideals. Another popular explanation is that the British came to grips with the enemy at once, while we delayed until the ringside blood-thirstiness had fastened itself upon us.

These are plausible explanations, and there may be something in them. But anyone who cares to puzzle the problem through will conclude that the real reason for the difference is that the Englishman is forced to practical views by his precarious

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

international position. He cannot afford to indulge himself in romantic illusions of vicious nations eternally to be hated and virtuous nations eternally to be loved. On this continent we had weak antagonists, and we finished them. We can go on fighting red coats, Injuns, Mexicans, rebels, and Spaniards in our dreams. We can hate them forever, if we like, because they are either extinct or negligible to us in our politics of isolation. But in Europe a nation fights, and lives to fight another day.

The European knows who were his friends, who his enemies, in the last war. He does not know who will be friend or foe in the next war. Hard experience has taught him that with the fated changes in international objectives, changes in the alignment of nations are inevitable. France is the ally today; she may be the enemy tomorrow, as Turkey is the enemy today though yesterday she was an ally and may be again tomorrow.

In a world like that a good Englishman cannot permit himself to be pro-French, pro-American, pro-Greek, pro-Japanese, nor anti-German, anti-Russian. The problem of the survival of the British nation is too real to him. He must be pro-British and nothing else. Permanent national friendships and animosities are sentimental luxuries he is compelled to eschew. We Americans can afford them, so long as we stand aloof from the world's affairs. We have a right to love and hate, provided we do not expect to be taken seriously.

Are Miners People?

IT takes a very ingenuous person to be surprised nowadays at any violation of civil rights of workingmen when their employers have the necessary economic power and find it to their advantage. Nevertheless, there are some instances of this defiance of American principles so flagrant that it is impossible to pass them by. If, for example, you were a coal miner in the non-union fields in Pennsylvania, in this year of our Lord nineteen hundred and twenty-three, you would find all or nearly all of the following things happening to you:

1. Your wages would in many cases be substantially lower than those paid for the same class of labor in the union fields.

2. The company which employed you would, in all probability, cheat you about the quantity of coal mined by you, to an amount running as high as four hundred pounds in the ton.

3. You would be required to do a large amount of non-productive "dead work" for nothing.

4. You would be subject to an arbitrary reduction of your wages at any time without notice, and sometimes without your knowledge until weeks after the reduction had come into effect.

5. If you ventured to act as spokesman for your fellows in the expression of any grievance, you would find yourself summarily dismissed and blacklisted.

6. If you had the temerity to go on strike and the hard luck to be living, as thousands of these miners do live, in a company-owned house, you would find yourself turned forthwith into the street, regardless of inclement weather or possible illness among members of your family.

7. When local elections took place, you might find yourself provided with a marked ballot or given verbal instructions as to the candidates you must vote for. Conspicuous activity on behalf of a candidate who is persona non grata to the company might earn you a dismissal and an order to get out of town in a hurry and stay out.

8. You would find yourself, almost anywhere in the district and at any time, absolutely deprived of the right of free speech and free assemblage, living in a town which no stranger may visit unless he can satisfactorily prove to the coal company that his intentions are "harmless."

These are some of the characteristic conditions, not only in Pennsylvania but elsewhere, which are described in a document submitted to the United States Coal Commission by John Brophy, President of District No. 2, of the United Mine Workers of America—a document which deserves the earnest consideration of every American who is interested in the perennial clash between political democracy and industrial oligarchy. Mr. Brophy is, to be sure, a possibly prejudiced witness; but most of his statements are well-corroborated from impartial sources.

The underlying condition which brings about the injustices we have enumerated, is succinctly set forth in the report of a special committee appointed not long ago by the Mayor of New York City to investigate the mining and living conditions in the region where the Berwind-White Coal Company operates. That report says:

> The Berwind-White Coal Company controls absolutely the Borough of Windber and the other towns wherein its mines are located. It owns the banks, the theatre, a number of public halls, the town newspapers and all the public service plants in Windber. All public officials in Windber, including the burgess, squires, councilmen and the police, are either employees of or in some way connected with the Berwind-White Company.

This situation, which also exists, of course, in connection with other coal companies, and in other states than Pennsylvania, gives the employer an extraordinary advantage in the case of labor troubles. A man living in a company-owned house who dares to go on strike is likely to find his family summarily and without mercy turned out into the street. That the companies make no bones of their policy in this regard is shown by the following typical document:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

L. C. Troxell,
Revloc, Pa.

Dear Sir:

Having ceased to work for the Monroe Coal Mining Company, you are hereby notified to quit, remove from and deliver to the undersigned, possession of the house and lot by you now occupied situated in Revloc, Cambria County, Pa., and known as house No. 121, on the plan of said town, five (5) days from the above date, as the undersigned desire again to have and repossess the same.

MONROE COAL MINING COMPANY.

Revloc, Pa., April 7, 1922.

By owning all the land upon which a town is located, the coal operator is able to maintain feudal conditions of complete autocracy. Numerous instances are on record where every stranger alighting from a train in such a town is approached by a policeman or a private mine guard and required to explain his errand. If this explanation is not satisfactory, he is ordered to leave town by the next train, and violence is sometimes used to enforce this decree. Public meetings have again and again been broken up by the use of force.

The treatment of the workers in the course of their ordinary relation with the mine owners is similar. In the document prepared by Mr. Brophy for the Coal Commission there are many cases of unfair treatment of the miners for which they have no redress. An instance is recorded where a small group of men, having struck because of dissatisfaction with local conditions, elected a spokesman to present their grievance to the foreman. This spokesman was promptly discharged and was told there would be no more work for him in that region. Cases are given where men paid by the ton have been "short-weighted" and required to perform non-productive "dead work" without pay. In some of the non-union fields the average wage, according to Mr. Brophy, is 28 cents a ton less for pick coal and 14 cents a ton less for machine. Day wages average $2.10 less than in the union field. Wages are reduced arbitrarily and without warning when the companies feel that they are in a position so to act. One instance is recorded of a drastic reduction in wages of which the men were not even notified until they received their pay envelopes some time later and discovered the difference.

All these conditions, as we have said, exist in the non-unionized fields. They help to explain why the non-union miners joined the union men in going on strike last year; and they give an adequate explanation of the bitterness with which the operators have fought these non-union strikers, flatly refusing to grant them the same terms on which the men in the unionized fields long ago went back to work. The motive of the operators is the plain and simple one of fat profits. There is more money to be made out of coal mined by broken-spirited, terrorized men who are afraid to take collective action, than is to be made when the workers are combined in an effective organization which not only protects them as to wages and working conditions, but enables them to maintain the elementary human rights of free speech and free assemblage.

Yet, as is usually the case when greedy capital puts no limits on its exploitation of the worker, the mine operators have over-reached themselves. The great American public cares little for the civil liberties of a few thousand miners in Pennsylvania and West Virginia; but it cares a great deal about the failure of the industry to provide coal to keep factories running and homes heated. The public is coming to realize that the coal industry is sick; and that it will never be well so long as the men who do the work suffer under a profound conviction of unjust treatment. That is probably why the first 451 ballots in The New Republic's straw vote contained 383 votes in favor of government ownership of the mines, and only 68 in opposition.

Over and over again, during the hundred years since the rise of the modern industrial system, the painful lesson has been driven home that goods produced at the cost of the workers' happiness come too dear, no matter how low their price. That lesson we are now learning again in regard to coal.

The Confiscation Bugaboo

AS if by a concerted impulse men of affairs all over the country are warning the public against an alleged movement for the confiscation of private property. Railway presidents, bankers, manufacturers and even college presidents and ministers of the Gospel have joined in the outcry. They would have us believe that somewhere in this country there is a powerful party that aims to destroy, first private property and then the government itself. The tone and the taste of this propaganda of fear are perfectly exemplified by a passage from a speech of W. H. Finley, president of the Chicago & Northwestern Railway, reported in the Times of June 14th:

> When you consider the sinister forces at work in this country today not only to destroy such industries as the railroads, but to attack the foundations and orderly processes of government as well, I can only repeat the words of our Saviour on that awful crucifixion, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

What are those sinister forces? Are the mighty men of industry and finance trembling before the advance of socialism? Socialism is not advancing in this country. On the contrary, it is retreating, if the fortunes of the Socialist party are any indication of its condition. Are they afraid of the communists affiliated with Moscow? The communists are an insignificant handful, barely sufficient to supply matter of argument to professional Cassandras like Condé Pallen and W. J. Burns. No: it is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not the real Reds that drive Mr. Finley and his kind to despair and blasphemy. It is La Follette, Shipstead, Brookhart, and the new progressivism they represent. They are the real menace. Moscow and the Reds are merely the moral tacked to the nursery story, in obvious violation of the plot.

And what is the terrible thing that these sinister forces are engineering? They are denying the principle of valuation of railways which the railway presidents and bankers consider most advantageous to their interests. They agree that the railways and other public service enterprises, so long as they remain in private hands, have a right to rates that will cover costs, including a fair return on investment. They agree that if the government takes over the railways the private owners will be entitled to full compensation for their actual investment. Where they disagree with the railway presidents is in their definition of the investment. The progressives would define the investment as the money actually put into the roads. The railway propagandists would define it as the physical property held by the roads, valued according to engineering estimates of cost of reproduction. There is nothing socialistic about either definition. Both accept private property as a premise above discussion. The progressive definition, curiously, is the more closely in harmony with the capitalistic principle, which rests on values, not on physical things.

But outside the field of principle the difference is enormous. We have, to be sure, no authoritative statement of the sums actually invested in the railways. A part of the investment was made in the period before intelligible and accurate accounts were kept. By far the greater part has, however, been made since the institution of adequate accounting systems, and it would be quite feasible to supplement the accounting data we possess with such estimates of the uncertain items as would be fair to both the railways and the public. But the fact is that the Interstate Commerce Commission has not yet worked out figures for actual investment. It has devoted its energies to the baffling task of finding the reproduction cost. That cost is going to run to twenty billions or over. The La Follette group estimates the actual investment at ten to twelve billions. This may be somewhat too low. But there can be no doubt whatever that the sum of value at stake will run to seven or eight billion dollars. And when we consider that whatever principle is adopted in valuing the railways will apply to all public service corporations, we can easily see why the propaganda on both sides is active and bitter. Between fifteen and twenty billion dollars are at stake. The French are ready to turn the world upside down to extract six or seven billion dollars from the German people. What will Mr. Finley and his kind do to extract fifteen or twenty billions out of the American people?

If the American people were setting out with a clean slate to regulate the relations between the corporations and the public there can be little doubt about the basis they would select. They would recognize that every dollar put into the service was entitled to an adequate return. In so far as a certain return could be assured, the rate would be a low one. In so far as risk was involved, a chance of a higher rate would have to be offered. But the basis in either case would certainly be money actually invested. We should never dream of substituting for the definite fact of actual investment—the only fact that counts in drawing investors to the field—the indefinite and fluctuating fact of the estimated value of the physical plant.

The actual investment, which the La Follette group are contending for as a basis of railway rates, commends itself to present-day common sense. Common sense, however, is one thing and law is another. It may be that the law, with its precedents antedating the present scheme of capitalistic relations, will validate the contentions of the public service corporations and enable them to charge us up with the fifteen or twenty billions by which the reproduction cost of their properties exceeds the actual investment. But in that case the nature of the burden saddled upon the people should be clear. It would be an indemnity charged against us by virtue of our defeat in the courts.

Since the decision of the Supreme Court in the Southwestern Bell Telephone Company case the spokesmen for the public service corporations have felt that this royal indemnity is within their reach. They have felt that these hypothetical billions were as good as awarded them. Naturally they feel that those who dispute the indemnity claim are the enemies of private property and orderly government, of man and God. Men will believe many absurdities, sincerely, for much less than twenty billions. But we, the people who are asked to pay —where is the stimulus to our belief? Is it possible that we can be frightened into belief by the silly bugaboo of confiscation?

Many strange things have been achieved by propaganda. It remains to be seen whether its virtue is supreme enough to achieve such a miracle as Mr. Finley and his brother magicians are trying to work.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1923, IN THE U. S., BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., INC., 421 WEST 21ST ST., NEW YORK.
HERBERT CROLY, PRES. ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREAS.
DANIEL MEBANE, CIRCULATION MANAGER.

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY BRUCE BLIVEN ROBERT LITTELL
ALVIN JOHNSON PHILIP LITTELL STARK YOUNG
ROBERT MORSS LOVETT

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JANE ADDAMS JOHN DEWEY R. H. TAWNEY
DAVID FRIDAY H. N. BRAILSFORD LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Rail Leaders Think

IN a recent speech Mr. Bryan waxed philosophical and remembered that after all the strongest man is not very much stronger than the weakest. He was speaking of the physical man, but there are times when it seems he might have included the mental man.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has been holding hearings on plans for consolidations of the railroads. The Transportation Act directs the commission to formulate plans and report them to Congress. The commission, advised by Professor William Z. Ripley, prepared tentative plans and then ordered the hearings to give the railroad executives opportunity publicly to express themselves.

Consolidation, as contemplated in the act, looks to such grouping of the railroads as would give the whole country the best transportation service, instead of such mergers as powerful railroads would voluntarily cause in the pursuit of their own profits. Therefore, the consolidation contemplated in the act involves rearrangement *from the outside* of the form and structure of an industry now tentatively estimated to be worth just short of twenty billion dollars, and employing upward of two million men.

Is Railroad Consolidation Wise?

Of course no rearrangement from the outside of so gigantic an industry should be undertaken unless the evidence points strongly to advantages distinct and sizable, for experience has demonstrated time and again the unwisdom of outside interference with industry unless there be such evidence. In the matter of consolidation there is a heavy weight of favorable evidence, sufficient to have convinced many sober and trained minds. But it happens to be a fact that very many railroad men challenge this evidence. Even the most liberal of them doubt the soundness of compulsory consolidation, arguing that at the most the government should outline a plan and let the railroads take it or leave it.

Under those circumstances, it might have been expected that the executives' testimony, at the public hearings on consolidation, would develop a profound discussion of the fundamentals of transportation; a searching inquiry into the comparative merits of the competitive principle and the cooperative principle, for the values argued for consolidation are to be found in a measurable substitution of cooperation for competition; and likewise a searching inquiry into the comparative merits of consolidations based on the profit motive of powerful roads and consolidations in which that motive would be subordinated to a conception of the relations of consolidated groups of roads to the country's transportation needs.

Well, what do we really get from the hearings; how far do the executives go in turning up the soil and revealing the roots of the criticisms which most of them are making privately of the plans for government conducted consolidations? Alfred H. Smith goes on the stand. He is president of the mammoth New York Central system. He does not look much, as the saying is. A tall man, muscular, coarse of voice, he would fit perfectly into a county fair scene if he were given deep sunburn and less well-fitting clothes. He reveals in a little while that it is such scenes that his heart loves. In a colloquy with Professor Ripley about a previous discussion relative to the disposition of certain roads, he says in a blunt, likable way: "Professor, I thought you were going to trade, but you did not bring out your horse. I'll trade on anything." President Smith submits a small wagon-load of maps and statistics, and reads a long statement. When he gets down to cases in consolidations, he is anxious that the Central of New Jersey should not be given to a consolidation system in which the Baltimore and Ohio would be dominant. He does not want the Baltimore and Ohio to be given such a foothold in the New York district and is very positive about it. There is little else of consequence. Mr. Smith's ideas, boiled down, show a maximum of thought about the New York Central and a minimum, and a very small one at that, about the consolidation scheme —whether it is sound or unsound, right or wrong. A microscope would not reveal in his statement a real contribution to the broad problem of a national railroad policy as it is involved in the consolidation project.

The President of the Pennsylvania

Samuel Rea goes on the stand. He is president of the mammoth Pennsylvania system. He is a rather slender man, a shade above the average height, with bright dark eyes behind glasses. He looks the part of the efficient business man, the sort having what is called nervous energy. In general appearance he can be duplicated a hundred thousand times. He too reads a long statement, which is not impressive. Afterwards he is examined, and is nervous, hesitant, barren, though he does not mean to be. He simply does not produce thought in a general discussion in public. One gets his prepared statement and reads it carefully to see whether something on the fundamentals of railroad policy may be found that escaped notice while Mr. Rea was reading it—something that matches the size of the president of the Pennsyl-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vania. After examining the statement, one is certain that any experienced financial reporter, told what was wanted, could have produced a stronger statement in two days. Mr. Rea is counted a critic of consolidation, but his criticisms in the statement are vague and elusive. His whole treatment of the question is trite. As President Smith was concerned that the Central of New Jersey should not go into the Baltimore and Ohio consolidation, so President Rea is concerned that the long relationship of his system with the New Haven and with the Norfolk and Western shall not be broken. On that he has conviction.

Daniel Willard goes on the stand. He is president of the Baltimore and Ohio. Traditionally, he plays the game differently from most of the big executives and he runs true to tradition now. He notices consolidation in its broader aspects, particularly in discussing the New England situation. He advises one consolidated system in New England, even at the expense of technical sacrifice of the law that calls for preservation of the competitive routes. New England's need, he thinks, is adequate transportation at the lowest possible cost, and he holds that this can be more nearly approximated by a single system than by dividing New England among several consolidated systems. He also thinks the commission and Professor Ripley have done very well in their consolidation plans, taken as a whole. Later, it appears that the protests of President Smith against giving the Baltimore and Ohio the Central of New Jersey have many echoes, and that there are emphatic protests against giving the Baltimore and Ohio the Reading. Certain cynical persons suggest that Mr. Willard manifests a deeper and broader interest in the consolidation project because the cards were running his way when the plans were being formed. Be that as it may, he lifts the executives' discussion of consolidation to an intellectually respectable level.

The Reading Is Heard From

It slumps immediately he leaves the stand and stays in the slump some time. Agnew T. Dice, president of the Reading, goes on the stand—as nice a picture of the financier and nothing but the financier as one could wish. A short, round, fat man without a sign of mental daring, the kind that wants all ideas put through three conservative laboratory tests before he is exposed to infection. He wishes the Reading and the Central of New Jersey left to continue their old close association, and to play in their accustomed way in the New York and Philadelphia territory, and he is opposed to putting them under the wing of the Baltimore and Ohio. That is about the extent of his contribution. Maxwell Byers goes on the stand. He is president of the Western Maryland that has been jockeyed for years as the nucleus of a possible new trunk line through the Pittsburgh district to the sea at Baltimore. He is a rather hawk-faced youngish man, who tells the sad story of the Western Maryland and thereupon drifts into cautious answers to questions, shedding no illumination whatever. And so on; executive after executive in dull succession, until grizzled old L. F. Loree, of the Delaware and Hudson, goes on the stand, and sharply swings the curve of discussion to the Willard peak and beyond, although he directs it in the opposite direction.

Loree: Snorting Irreconcilable

He has been sitting day after day in the hearing room, his clothes rumpled all over his burly body, his hair tousled down on his forehead, his cutwater nose tilted sniffishly in the air. As one after another executive has gone on to plead for his own properties, and in nearly all cases to neglect the underlying question or to skirt timidly around it, the Loree nose has tilted higher and higher, and has become more and more sniffish. He thinks the world is going to the devil, and he damns the men who are faint in damning those responsible for the choice of the world's destination. He made a speech some years ago in which he said there was too much chatter about the brotherhood of man, and not enough attention to the fatherhood of man. He was not very clear about the fatherhood, but he knew exactly what and how he felt about the brotherhood notion. And in all these modern ideas about the railroads, he is a snorting irreconcilable. So, taking the stand, he proceeds in a vibrant voice to lecture the commission on its duty to recommend to Congress the repeal of the whole law looking to consolidations; to declare bluntly that no consolidation plan worthy the name has been prepared by the commission or anyone else; to resurrect boldly the late "Fire Alarm Joe" Foraker, whom Roosevelt stamped to political extinction in 1908 as a tool of the interests, and to propose the plan offered by Foraker in the railroad debate of 1906, permitting the roads to combine according to their own ideas; to throw in liberally a lengthy disquisition on the merits of the capitalistic system in general; and then—well, if everybody insists upon going ahead with this fool undertaking, he is to be understood as plainly demanding changes that will build a new consolidated group around his road, instead of putting it down in the middle of the list of roads to be put in another consolidation. Maybe it was not war, things being as they are and not as they were in Mr. Loree's halcyon days; but it approached a certain magnificence.

After Mr. Loree, more executives of the general run and increasing dullness. What is had from these eastern men is on a par with what was had previously from western executives. Three years ago most of the executives were extremely critical of the Transportation Act, which they now put forward as the untouchable. And today with the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

really great question of consolidation up, the large majority of them talk before the Interstate Commerce Commission like men of key-hole vision—these mighty men of mighty enterprise.

What does it all mean? Would Mr. Bryan have been right had he included the mental with the physical man in his observation that the strongest is not much stronger than the weakest? Or is it true that these men are mighty in matters of dollars and cents, and undeveloped in other matters—that the majority of them are incapable of understanding the broader social and economic aspects of transportation; that while they deal powerfully with material things, their minds halt and falter when brought to bear on the formulation of principles?

And does it mean that the initiative and leadership in the treatment of the transportation question must pass to the Cumminses and the La Follettes in Congress, and to the Ripleys in the colleges, with the practical railroad men, except in two or three instances, relegated to the position of critics and polishers?

JOHN W. OWENS.

Mr. Kahn Would Like to Know

THE other day Mr. Otto H. Kahn delivered an address in which he complained that he had yet to hear an answer to a question which he had repeatedly addressed to advocates of the existing League. He had been asking: "How are you going to get away from the congenital taint of the League, which consists in its being attached to, and made the preserver and guardian of, the war settlements?"

This is a fair question, a searching question, and the only really important question that bears upon America's attitude towards the League. It is, I feel certain, the question which most bothers those readers of the New Republic who would naturally be the strongest supporters of the League of Nations if they did not feel that the League existed, as Mr. Kahn says, "to preserve and perpetuate the structure" of the peace treaties.

Were this the year 1919, and were there no evidence at hand other than the state of mind of the principal peacemakers at Paris, the answer, it seems to me, would be clear. The League in general, Article X in particular, was conceived as a way of preserving and perpetuating the settlements of Paris. There were grave doubts about the permanence of those settlements among the peacemakers themselves, and in Articles XI and XXIV as well as in the Reparation Commission, a rather feeble attempt was made to make the peace elastic to future revision. But in the main the League of 1919 may fairly be said, as Mr. Kahn assumes, to have been conceived as the guardian of the war settlements.

But even if this were not true of the League as such, it was true for any power which entered the League by signing the Paris treaties. Ratification of those treaties certainly implied an obligation as a member of the League to act so as to preserve the treaties. No such obligation, of course, rested upon members of the League like Switzerland or Sweden. But for members who had signed the treaties, Articles XI and XXIV were morally inoperative. Only states which had been neutral in the war could, therefore, regard the League as a machine for amending these dangerous treaties. But these neutral states are the minor powers. So long as all the major powers in the League were morally committed by the treaties, and beneficiaries under them, there was no political power in the rest of the League great enough to grapple with the treaties.

The League is still impotent to revise the treaties no matter how disturbing they may be to the peace of the world. In this respect the situation has not changed since 1919. But in another respect it has changed radically, and here is the beginning of what I think is the real answer to Mr. Kahn's question. *The League has not in fact been the preserver and guardian of the war settlements.* While the League has failed to revise them, it has also failed to protect them. The Treaty of Sèvres was not, for good or ill, protected by the League. That treaty is at this moment being rewritten at Lausanne. The League has certainly not insisted upon the rigors of the treaty with Austria. It has if anything helped to revise that treaty. The League has not enforced the Treaty of Versailles against Germany in any real sense of the word. It has administered the Saar and it partitioned Upper Silesia, but certainly it is correct to say that in the Franco-German war after the war, the League has been an impotent neutral. The League has proved to be a disappointment both to those who wished to preserve the treaties and to those who wished to revise them.

This means that in the great political struggles of the world today the League, in spite of its original pretensions, plays no decisive rôle. Because they are thinking of the League's pretensions rather than of its history, the enemies of the League sneer at the League one moment because it is impotent and tremble at it the next because it is a devouring superstate. But the truth is that the League is not at the centre of world politics and is therefore powerless to do either the evil or the good usually expected of it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yet the League continues to exist. I think the League is increasing in prestige. This is true in the sense that the neutral members, the uncommitted members, are constantly more active and self-assertive in its councils. From Assembly to Assembly you can see, I think, the decline of the influence of the war-time allies, divided amongst themselves, and the rising influence of the old neutrals. It is true in the sense that the men associated with the League are ever so much less the agents of their foreign offices, and ever so much more consciously "League of Nations men." The League is no longer merely a project. It is an institution commanding among influential men in all countries personal loyalties great enough to cause deep divisions within the foreign offices and national parliaments themselves.

This is a subtle thing, but it seems to me one of the great facts in the situation, because it cuts so deeply into the kind of nationalism which would make any sort of world cooperation impossible. And unless a man believes in an international proletarian revolution, which I do not, he will find, I think, in practically every country in Europe, that the individuals and parties most devoted to the League are also the individuals and parties on whom he must count for revision of the treaties at home and abroad. It seems to me a fact that if the war settlements are to be revised by consent and not by force, the revision will be carried out under the pressure or the leadership of the groups who support the League of Nations. Only in America, among the victors in the war, does hostility to the treaties so often involve hostility to the League. In Britain, France, Italy and neutral Europe, a desire to amend the treaties is almost always associated with devotion to the League.

A Strong League and Revised Treaties

This means, unless the unworkable war settlements break down in a revolutionary chaos, that the treaties are most likely to be amended, not by the League, but by the men and parties who support the League. It means the rise to power within the various countries of men who are (1) opposed to reactionary supporters of the treaties and (2) anxious to strengthen the League against the return of the reactionaries. It seems to me, therefore, most probable that the revision of the treaties and the strengthening of the League will be two aspects of the same liberal political victory.

Therefore, my answer to Mr. Kahn's question would be this: (1) In the major politics of Europe today the League is impotent. (2) Being impotent, it has been used by the foreign offices not as guardian of the war settlements, but as a sort of harmless diversion for men who had been bitten by the experiences of the war and had somehow to be placated. (3) These men have taken the League seriously, have kept it going, and have made it an institution. The League has become not the tool of the international reactionaries, but a tool of the liberal opposition parties.

Therefore, when Senator Borah or Mr. Kahn lists all the calamities the League has failed to prevent, I am not impressed. I remember that Lord Curzon, M. Poincaré, and Signor Mussolini are in power. What impresses me is that whether you look at British Liberalism or British Labor, at the France which is not National Bloc, or at the Italy which is not Fascist, there you find the friends of the League. That the League is impotent for evil is excellent, that the League is not potent for good, when its supporters are on the opposition benches, seems to me inevitable. The forces of the League are not in power, and therefore the principal function of the League at the moment is to continue to exist and to train its personnel for the day when the tide of reaction subsides in Europe.

Why America Should Join

It seems to me important that the United States should be a member of the League early enough to grow up with it. Nothing spectacular should be expected as a result merely of our joining. In this respect both the enemies and friends of the League tend to exaggerate. By joining* as we should join now, *absolutely uncommitted under the Treaty of Versailles,* we should stand like any other neutral, like the League organization itself, outside the main struggle in Europe.

Our coming might give some confidence to the neutrals and the opposition parties by increasing the prestige of the League for which they stand. On this sort of thing it is best not to count, however. The main thing is that the League would be that much nearer a completed League of Nations, that much less under the shadow of the old war alliance. We should acquire some needed experience of a complicated subject, and would be in a better position to play our part and guard our interests when in the future the League comes into power in Europe.

This coming into power of the League seems to me the only visible check upon the formation in Europe of two armed coalitions, one under French leadership and the other under British. I do not feel at all certain that the League can prevent this outcome, but I can think of nothing else that might. But if we have a right to hope, and wish to act even though the hope cannot be guaranteed, it seems to me our best hope lies in

* In its issue of November 10, 1920, following the election of 1920, The New Republic, summing up the long contest over the League said: "It has now been decided by the election campaign that America will not accept the obligations of the European settlement. The New Republic sees no further ground for irreconcilability by American liberals." Cf. also the preceding and subsequent issues.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the coming into power of the League. It lies, that is to say, in the victory of liberal-minded men at home, in the strengthening within the League of the neutral powers of which the United States would be the greatest, and in drawing into the League all the nations that are now excluded.

Considering the peril now threatened by the conflict between a French and an anti-French alliance, it seems to me more than ever important to throw what influence we possess to an organization which in principle and in all sincerity does look in another direction. And this organization is, after all, a remarkable event in the history of mankind. Even after we have written off all false hopes and admitted the League's mistakes and emphasized its present impotence, one fact remains: fifty sovereign nations have actually organized somehow for peace. They have created a machinery of consultation and conciliation. They have established the first permanent machinery for the impartial investigation of disputes. They have made a Permanent Court. And even though they have agreed to some things they do not mean, have done things they promised not to do, and left almost everything undone we may wish they had done, this fact of union turns the scales in favor of the League decisively. That there is a union in the world seems ever so much more important than the pros and cons of how that union in the first few years of its existence has behaved.

WALTER LIPPMANN.

Meiklejohn of Amherst

THE circumstances surrounding the resignation of President Meiklejohn of Amherst are doubtless more complicated than they would appear to Mr. Upton Sinclair. They reflect all the various aspects of the problem of the American college today, educational, financial, administrative. President Meiklejohn went to Amherst eleven years ago with a special program, that of modernizing the curriculum, of developing courses in history, social science and political economy, while at the same time correcting the tendencies toward desultory variety which accompany the elective system, and emphasizing the unity of the educational process. He was obliged to be both innovator and reactionary. It was a task in educational engineering which President Meiklejohn expounded in his article on The Unity of the Curriculum in the educational supplement of the New Republic last October. In his view education is not a fixed sum of static information and belief, but rather a means of growth. He defined the difference between himself and his opponents in [redacted] valedictory address at the commencement luncheon of the Amherst alumni.

> I find two different views with regard to intelligence. Some people believe that intelligence is a thing you can have, that you can get and keep, that it comes down out of the past, that it is handed down by the teacher, that you can find it in a book, that it is there to be taken. It is not. Thinking, or intelligence, is a thing that you must do, it is a function of the human spirit, it is something that men must undertake if they are to have guidance of life.

To secure the acceptance of this qualitative view of education in the face of the quantitative plan, largely in vogue, was the task of an educational statesman. Since it had to be accomplished with human material, students and faculty, alumni and trustees, it called for persuasiveness and tact. With the students President Meiklejohn has been almost wholly successful. The trustees seem to have been won to the merits of his plan, and to have supported it for a time, retreating at last in the face of opposition. With his faculty he appears to have failed. It is not surprising. President Meiklejohn's effort necessarily interfered with that departmental autonomy which has grown strong under the quantitative system. Every college faculty includes a goodly number of men devotedly loyal to their own interests who resist with the desperation of a struggle for survival any introduction of new blood or new methods. The most besetting problem of any constructive college administration is dealing with the special privilege and vested interests represented in the faculty. As President Meiklejohn ruefully observed on the occasion before mentioned, "The faculty finds it exceedingly difficult to improve themselves and they find it exceedingly objectionable to have anyone else do it for them." It may well be that President Meiklejohn did not exercise the patience and the tact necessary to solve this problem. It speaks well for his sportsmanship, however, that he still confesses his faith in democratic control of colleges by the faculty, and the abolishing of trustees "when the faculty is ready to take their place."

Besides students and faculty there is a force to reckon with in the organized alumni. Of late years the effort to raise endowments has led colleges to appeal to their graduates on a basis of renewed interest in the affairs of the institution. It is superfluous to point out that this interest is a danger. The alumni are as a body conservative as respects their alma mater. They love their college as they remember it in the past. Again, the great number of them are unable to follow closely the developing situation, and allow the power of their organization to be wielded by a few, often those most ardent in their devotion, and most narrow in their out-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

look. The great number of active graduates today grew up in colleges obsessed by two passions, athletics and numbers. President Meiklejohn has enjoyed an honorable distinction among his peers by the boldness with which he has attacked these obsessions. He has denounced the exaggerated interest in intercollegiate sports, with the disintegration of studious habit, the lowering of intellectual standards, and the positive corruption of professionalism, which accompany them. He has maintained for Amherst the ideal of the small college with high standards of fitness, and resisted the temptation to extend its scope and enlarge its numbers beyond the capacity of its resources. In both matters he challenged alumni opinion on dangerous ground.

President Meiklejohn vs. the Older Alumni

Of the younger alumni, President Meiklejohn had the hearty support, but the older, more influential graduates, who belong to the years before his presidency, were against him. A typical alumni campaign was outlined in an interview in the New York Tribune for June 16th.

"There is just one issue at stake," said Mr. Harry E. Taylor, advertising manager of the Dry Goods Economist, "whether President Meiklejohn is a suitable president for Amherst College." On analysis this issue resolves itself into the question of the validity of President Meiklejohn's educational and intellectual ideals. Mr. Taylor cited certain specific reports which we can imagine at work like yeast in alumni opinion. To the question "Would you have a Bolshevik as professor?" President Meiklejohn replied, "I'd have anyone if he were a good teacher." He further said that a man's moral beliefs had nothing to do with his fitness for a professorship, morality being "a debatable subject." Clearly in these instances, if they are to be taken seriously at all, President Meiklejohn was expressing his confidence in his educational objective—to make the student independent in his intellectual life, to teach him to think for himself. Education in his view is a tool, and if the Bolshevik can teach the student to use it he supplies a test for his opinions. It may be suggested moreover, that perhaps President Meiklejohn was thinking more of the difficulty of obtaining good teachers than of the implications of the terms in which he described this difficulty.

A more serious charge is that President Meiklejohn insisted that, at a meeting to promote "preparedness" projected by alumni on the campus six months before the war, those opposed to war should be represented. "That is what nettled the alumni most against Dr. Meiklejohn," said Mr. Frank Kane, manager of the United Publishers Corporation, "his attitude against what all red-blooded Americans were thinking at that time." Here again appears President Meiklejohn's faith in the freedom of thought and scrupulous observance of educational ethics. Instead of flinging the young lives entrusted to him into battle, reckless of whether it was to be fought for the safety of democracy or the secret treaties, he stood out as an honorable exception to college presidents and head masters, by giving his students a chance to think for themselves. This is the exact point in the issue between President Meiklejohn and the older alumni. "There is no issue as to whether Amherst shall be a liberal college," said Mr. Taylor ". . . *providing that what men think shall be assumed as the responsibility of the college.*" It is the quality of President Meiklejohn's liberalism that he refuses to accept responsibility for what his students think, and insists on throwing on them the responsibility of thinking for themselves. If the issue is not whether Amherst is to remain a liberal college, it may be defined as what Amherst thinks liberalism is.

Undergraduate Loyalty

In contrast to President Meiklejohn's failure with his faculty and older alumni is his conspicuous success in winning the student body during his eleven years of office, and yet until recent events no one knew how immense that success was. When the question of removing the president was mooted the graduating class of Amherst sent a committee to New York to interview the trustees in his behalf. In spite of President Meiklejohn's pleading thirteen actually declined to receive degrees from the college which had repudiated him. Whatever may be thought of these expressions as a matter of tactics they are surprising signs of independence of thought and boldness of action on the part of the students of an American college. They recall the romantic devotion of the students of a mediaeval university to their intellectual leaders. They suggest something rare and beautiful in the relation of a teacher to his followers; the thirteen Amherst dissenters remind one of the Oxford men who followed Newman to Littlemore.

For it is to be repeated that President Meiklejohn has won the hearts of his students on intellectual grounds. An article in The Amherst Student reflects mature undergraduate opinion on this matter.

> It may be that those who oppose the president have grounds for their opposition in conditions that are unknown to the student body. But what the latter does know about the president regards the main function that he is here to perform. . . . Under his inspiration men who before saw education as a cut and dried compulsory affair of dull facts and duller figures have seen it take on color and meaning until it has become for them a living thing fraught with all the significance of life. They have learned that education is not alone the absorption of a text book, but much more an interpretation of the spirit of the study.

This testimony seems fairly to outweigh all other factors in the case. After all, the students are the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

college in a more intimate sense than faculty, trustees, or alumni. The college exists for them; they are the test of the worth of its existence. And the success of President Meiklejohn in bringing to them a sense of what college is for, and leading them to cooperation in realizing its aims, is so unique and surprising as to have a value in American education far beyond the claims of the immediate and local situation at Amherst. The trustees might well have decided to put up with difficulties in the budget, and to endure the objurgations of the one hundred percent loyal alumni; they might even have sacrificed some of the ancient sages of the faculty and given a shock to the security of academic tenure in the interest of a genuine triumph for college education. The Amherst Student was right when it said: "Harmony at the sacrifice of President Meiklejohn is too dearly bought."

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

Why the Mark Sank

THIS evening's paper carries the report that the Bank of Germany has issued nearly 9,000 billion marks of notes, and that new issues are appearing at the rate of nearly 1,000 billion per week. A few days ago the dollar was quoted in Berlin at over 150,000 marks, and today in New York the rate was almost the same. As these words are read the market may chance for a short time to be higher, but as the months pass the trend will continue downward. Nothing is yet in sight to suggest a change for the better.

We say the cause of the mark's decline is inflation. The printing presses have been at work turning out great volumes of paper money, until the huge supply has depressed the price. As the issues increased, the value of marks in the world's markets declined still more, while their internal value also fell, being reflected in a rising price level.

But why the huge supply? Are the Germans right in claiming that the trillions of marks now outstanding are due to their attempt to pay an impossibly large reparation demand, or are their critics correct in asserting that Germany has brought her troubles upon herself? Is the present situation a tragedy for which the Allies are responsible, or is it another Teutonic plot, another diabolical plan by which Germany will be able to triumph over her foes?

Would that the issue were a clear one, and that it could be approached by all observers in a calm, unbiassed manner. But economic and political issues are never clear and simple, and few of us can detach ourselves sufficiently from the dispute to give an impartial verdict. Right and wrong are to be found on both sides of the argument, and nearly all who debate the question feel in duty bound to defend one position against the other. In the confusion an accurate view is hard to obtain. Personal observations, even of skilled investigators, can never be more than partial in their scope, and statistics are peculiarly fallible when business is so unsettled and prices fluctuate so widely.

Fortunately there are a few matters upon which agreement ought not to be hard. One is that we need not expect to find the Golden Rule illustrated in international relations. Neither the French nor the Germans are planning to forgive their enemies or to make practical application of the Sermon on the Mount. Each side is seeking to gain at the other's expense, and neither plans when struck on one cheek to turn the other.

This being true, there are several comments that may safely be made about the Germans. Few, if any, of them consider Germany was alone to blame for the war, and most of them accordingly do not want to pay reparations. Nor do the Germans enjoy paying taxes any more than do the French, the Italians, the English, or even the Americans. Yet reparations mean taxes, and heavy ones at that—heavier, if paid, than those borne by the people of any other country in the world. Then, too, a weak government could not, if it would, assess and collect taxes in a rigorous manner.

It is, then, probably true that the Germans both as individuals and through their government have been ready to evade and procrastinate to the limit. It is certain that tax-payers would employ every conceivable subterfuge to escape the burden. Wealth would be concealed, personal property would be shifted to other countries, "the flight of the mark" would doubtless occur. Why expect anything else? Guilt and innocence may or may not be involved in the argument, but the behavior of Germans is similar to that of other "economic men" in every country under the sun.

But would these motives of self-interest lead them deliberately to plan inflation? Has there been a gigantic plot to issue paper money in an ever increasing flood in order to evade payments? Have the Germans deliberately brought on a financial catastrophe to deceive the rest of the world? Is Germany economically strong, though financially weak? Is the whole situation a deliberate hoax?

One hesitates at the suggestion that sixty-five million people could very effectively enter into a conspiracy, or that even their leaders could formu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

late and carry out such a plan in secret. Conceivably a few leaders might be able to draw up such a plan, but no large number could be entrusted with the details or even with the main idea. A secret conspiracy among millions of people is an absurdity.

Particularly does it seem impossible when we dwell for a moment on the consequences of inflation to certain groups in the community. It is often pointed out that many debtors have been able easily to pay off their obligations in depreciated marks. Thus the Hamburg-American line borrowed a large sum before the war, when paper marks were at a par with gold, and recently paid its debt with paper marks that were abundant and easy to acquire. Now the company is free of debt. But how about the owners of those bonds? Would they have willingly assented to such a plan had they known of it in advance? And how about the other bondholders whose income payable in marks has shrunk to a minute fraction of its former size? How about the thousands with fixed incomes—government employees and others, whose earnings are now so pitifully small? What of the present holders of the many new security issues? For March 1923, the Frankfurter Zeitung gave capital increases as 13,800,000,000 marks and for April 15,900,000,000 marks. Are the holders of these securities the gainers by inflation when every passing day lessens the purchasing power of the interest and dividends they receive? Are the banks who hold large quantities of the trillions of Treasury bills issued by the government to be congratulated on their wealth?

If all these participated in the plot they were certainly duped, for no conceivable reparation payment could have brought them such disaster as has inflation. They were scarcely so naïve as to be deceived on such a matter, and among them were persons of wealth and influence who would have made their objections felt had they been consulted.

The Real Cause of Inflation

But are there none who have gained? Undoubtedly many have, for this is always the result in a period of rapidly rising prices. But the elimination of the large groups just mentioned, who could and doubtless would have blocked such a plan, makes the plot theory highly untenable. Besides, the real cause is so obvious as to make other explanations unnecessary. It is one that reflects no credit on the Germans nor any discredit on the Allies (except the charge of impatience and indiscretion).

Discussions of German inflation usually centre about the supply of marks and the outward evidences of German prosperity. Let us briefly examine the two, taking the latter point first.

Is Germany prosperous? In many particulars she has been, particularly through the year 1922. Her factories, farms and railroads were active, and unemployment was light. There has been some building construction, although many observers have exaggerated the amount because misled by special operations that came to their attention.

That much of this was the feverish activity always found in a period of rapidly rising prices is doubtless true, but we need not stop now to elaborate the point. It is mentioned merely for the purpose of drawing the distinction between internal economic activity and capacity to make large external payments. The two are not identical.

This leads to the other of the two points mentioned—the supply of marks. Instead of discussing the supply, attention should be directed to the demand for them, for in this case the supply has appeared in response to the demand.

Germany's Credit Before and After the War

This need not be presented as a bald statement without proof, for proof is easy, and is facilitated by figures furnished by the French economist, Charles Rist. He states that prior to the war Germany bought abroad each year merchandise worth 9,750 million marks, and sold merchandise worth 8,250 million marks. There was thus an annual deficit of 1,500 million marks on merchandise account, which was more than met by three items: the earnings of her merchant marine, 500 million marks; tourists in Germany, earnings of German banks, insurance companies, etc., 500 million marks; interest and dividends on foreign investments, 1,500 million marks. This gave an annual credit of 1,000 million marks which was invested abroad, increasing each year the amount of German foreign security holdings.

What happened during and after the war? The merchant marine was taken by the Allies, thus depriving Germany of an earning power of 500 million marks, taking the pre-war receipts as a basis. Like other belligerents, Germans disposed of many security holdings during the conflict, until the Honorable Reginald McKenna last October estimated the amount now held abroad at about one billion dollars, or five billion marks. This estimate be it remembered, is after the "flight of the mark," and is a forceful reply to the wild statements frequently made by irresponsible commentators. Pre-war holdings of foreign securities were from twenty to twenty-five billion marks, or from four to five times McKenna's estimate of the present volume.

Nor was this all. Certain rich areas, including Alsace, Lorraine and a part of Upper Silesia, were lost to Germany, while the area on the left bank of the Rhine was rendered less valuable by the occupation. There has been a reduction of about thirteen percent in her area and about ten percent

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in her population, while she has lost all of her colonies.

There is no occasion here to suggest that Germany was unjustly penalized by the Treaty of Versailles, or to compare the terms of that pact with the Treaty of Frankfort or the one signed at Brest-Litovsk. Let us assume that every provision of the document was wise. May we repeat also that we are not trying to decide whether Germany is actually prosperous. For present purposes that prosperity may be assumed whether it exists or not, just as we are assuming a desire of the Germans to evade payment of reparations.

Water from the German Stone

How did the German government pay reparations until August 1922? Ignoring numerous complicating details, it was by delivering to the Reparation Commission drafts on London, Paris and New York to the amount called for. The terms of the Treaty called for gold marks, but of course drafts or foreign exchange were very properly used.

But how could the German government secure this exchange, these drafts on banks in other countries? Only in the same way you or I could do it —by buying from those who had them to sell, and the sellers are for the most part the bankers of Berlin. But these bankers could not sell drafts on London and elsewhere unless they had accounts there on which to draw, so we must seek the usual origin of such accounts. A New York bank, say the Guaranty Trust Company, secures London funds because an American ships cotton to an English buyer, draws a draft on him (or his bank), and sells the draft to the Guaranty Trust Company, which then collects the amount due and holds it on deposit in London. Or an American might conceivably carry English goods or passengers in his vessels and receive drafts on London in payment. English tourists in America would meet their expenses here by cashing London drafts, or American holders of foreign bonds would present the interest coupons to their bankers on this side.

In such ways as these the Guaranty Trust Company ordinarily acquires London funds, and is thus able to sell drafts to purchasers. It must be noticed that this exchange arises from the sale of American goods, from the rendering of service to foreigners, or by the collection of interest due on foreign investments. Similarly the Berlin banks would sell London exchange only in case Germans were selling goods abroad or rendering services to foreigners or collecting interest on foreign investments. Have Germans been doing these things?

Statistics are very unsatisfactory, but so nearly as they can be calculated the value of German exports in 1922 was no more than forty percent of the exports of 1913. In weight they were only about thirty-three percent. Germans formerly rendered service with their fleet, but they lost all their ships in 1919, and as yet their new fleet can presumably earn little in a depressed market. Their investments abroad are probably but a fraction of their pre-war holdings and yield only a small return.

With this curtailed supply of exchange, did demand for it decrease? Remember that Germany regularly imports a considerable part of her food, and that her population had decreased only ten percent. Remember also that Germany is extensively industrialized and that to an important extent her activity is dependent on the importation of raw materials. Food and raw materials must be paid for, and importers do it by purchasing foreign exchange from the banks. To this demand was added that of the government for reparation funds.

What could be done? The Allies were demanding payment, exchange was not available in the ordinary ways. Gullible, greedy speculators and a few trusting German sympathizers in Europe and America were eager to buy marks. Whether the German government sold marks abroad or even encouraged their sale the writer does not know. It makes little difference. The marks were sold and additional funds secured.

But this assumes that the German government had plenty of funds, and suffered only from a scarcity of foreign exchange. Actually this was not the case. Political insecurity, an exhausted soil, depreciated equipment and other post-war ills meant an impoverished exchequer and annual deficits. The government secured its funds in rapidly growing amounts by borrowing notes from the Reichsbank, giving its short time bills in exchange.

Whether the budget could and would have been balanced had there been no demand for reparation payments will probably never be known, but a glance at the experience of other countries is not reassuring. Only a few have accomplished the feat, and their progress toward "normalcy" has been slow.

There Was No Inflation Plot

The theory of a plot may be dismissed. There may have been a few Germans so ignorant, so greedy and so heartless as to have desired inflation for their own gain. They might actually have attempted to carry out the plan, although that seems impossible. But the Allies saved them the trouble. How much the Germans could have paid in reparations if time had been allowed them, and if they could have been induced to try, no one can say. But time, patience and willingness were all absent, and they have a convincing explanation for what has occurred. The Allies have furnished an "alibi."

ERNEST MINOR PATTERSON.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Dilemma of Marriage

EVERY generation has its leading anti-feminist, one who formulates with a new emphasis the age-old complaints against women. So it will continue until women themselves, less acquiescently entrapped, rapacious and thought-dulled, are freed from economic servitude in their relations with men, and attain enough sex nonchalance to intimidate the male heart. In the meantime, how interesting it might prove to compile a volume matching off masculine inconsistencies regarding women. Remy de Gourmont sees them as awkwardly trying to adapt their subterranean intuitions to a language invented and developed by men, while in a recent magazine Mr. Edward Thurber implies that language was developed exclusively by woman, "moulded and cherished" by her for a use. Again, Jonathan Swift, with an electric storm of satire, strips her of her powder and paint, while Max Beerbohm, with the effete, delightful dandyism of the nineties, deftly puts it on again. Science, bringing up the rear in the latest language of the behaviorists, states that both sexes, as infants, react identically to a given stimulus. Only Mr. Shaw, stern moralist that he is, would banish from the face of the earth the entire nefarious business.

Now, the latest evangelist to blow a startled bugle-call in the interests of his sex is Mr. D. H. Lawrence. His method is not one of attack. Like a sensitive miner digging through to the vein of original matter Mr. Lawrence, with his nervous, excited perceptions, sharpened by his emotional frustrations, turns over the rich soil of sex and reveals the hard, inflammable kernel of creation. When he is thus revelatory he is full of a strange and positive poetry. No one has uncovered more searchingly those obscure, poisoning enmities between men and women whose wills are crossed, nor composed and executed such a rich heavy music of the emotions—the music of sex itself, which druggingly compels men and women into the still, sharp death of each other's arms, only to let them part, thwarted or ironically freed. It is when Mr. Lawrence lays down the pen of the artist and dons the surplice of the preacher that one wishes to quarrel with him. What is this new message that threads in scarlet letters in and out of his latest novels? Woman must accept a new kind of mystical subjugation. Men and women are separate, yet woman's receptivity must be reasserted—this time in positive, not negative terms. Man may enter or escape the enchanted circle of sex, woman must remain forever engirdled within it. Like a robe of soft silk pliant to the lines of the figure, she must cede to the male assertion. And her reward —what of that? A tranced peace, a sub-life of strange untroubled beauty, far from the hard, fleeting world, where cold intellectual concepts, like hailstones driven on a relentless wind, sting between the eyes to thought. Women must find in sex that old unity which for so long has been spun out of the desires of human beings in order to cover over a knowledge of those sharp, unyielding truths which gather about their feet—that familiar old illusion of unity that the strong, the fierce and the defeated laugh to scorn. Suffering, his vulnerability ever freshly assaulted, Mr. Lawrence wishes to attain for himself an intrepidity of separateness. Yet woman he *must* have, absolutely he *must,* so with cunning frightened industry he exorcises her into sex obedience—the modern, investigatory, subtly alive, defiantly free woman.

It is too late! The old illusion is floating rapidly away. Mr. Lawrence must adapt himself. Men are indeed separate, set rigidly in the mould of their egoism, moving always in its little orbit of light. So are women. There is no unity in sex. There is no unity in life. At the very best, there is only an identification of interests, at times an armed neutrality, and rarely a glowing comradeship.

Women are still, to a large extent, secretive, proprietary, jealous, hypocritical in the sex relation, because they have developed these qualities in their economic struggles for shelter and a mate, just as men have developed the same qualities and legitimized them into institutions and codes of honor in their competitive struggles for power in the business, political and professional worlds. But granted an equality of income, and an equal sex emancipation, what still insurmountable barrier exists between men and women in a relationship uncomplicated by children?

The pure sex instinct is always explorative, destructive, aberrant. It is stimulated only through new, and ever newer adventures. In practice it is a game in which each is seeking covertly for advantage, like animals stalking their prey, so that a culmination of the pursuit means a cessation of excitement. The game is over, and with a capture, where no ambushed reserves are suspected, comes a sense of satisfied power to one and humiliation to the other, ending in ennui and misery. Yet if sex were just that and nothing more, life would be simple, indeed.

But side by side with the explorative impulse is the protective or tender impulse. Tenderness, one of the strongest, most beautiful and cunningly perfidious of human emotions! Perhaps the explorative impulse has become suddenly fused with that of tenderness, and the expression of such an ecstasy is an experience of transcendent beauty, as swiftly cutting as pain and as unenduring in the memory. It is an illusion, if one will, but an illusion more potent to move than almost any other in life. But

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the frisson itself is stimulated by strangeness; it is indissolubly attached to the explorative impulse, and tenderness, which in its pure state is sacrificial and protective, is inimical to this other impulse, which is furtive and destructive.

What is the result of all this? Men and women are drawn together in the entangling net of sex, drawn together in the glamour of an illusion. They marry. The explorative impulse, always inconstant in its very nature, is soon satisfied and veers away—perhaps in months, perhaps in years. Some couples, thwarted, dismayed, each angrily blaming the other for what is inevitable, drift rapidly into enmity and separation. Others refuse to face the truth and build a small, thought-tight little world, banked about with narcotic devices, where is daily slain with mutual consent the free, inquiring soul of the other. Sometimes jealousy fans the old flame to life, or the strangeness flares out again in unexpected places, but such a strangeness is full of torture and feverish aridity—the torture of a Strindberg—recriminations, rationalizations, sometimes suicide or murder. Far more usual it is, that when the exciting or sensuous quality of love disappears, the human quality of tenderness or affection remains. Gradually men and women become really dependent on each other, and construct a whole chain of delicately binding associations, thus achieving a tolerant attachment. And in some rare instances pity rivets one mate to the other—pity that makes slaves of the strong and tyrants of the weak.

Why, then, we ask, are men and women willing to give up the pursuit of sex, the most thrilling seal of their potency, that hardening of purpose, increasing of excitement, and quickening of fire in the pulse, for this quiet lock-step of habit? It is because almost equally strong in human beings with this adventurous impulse is their desire for security, a haunting, ever recurring fear of desertion. What every man and every woman would really like would be a mate who would love with a profound, intelligent, undeviating, unasking love, a love as firmly set as the roots of an oak tree, enduring through sin, abandonment and turpitude of the vilest sort, someone who would smilingly go to the stake for them, and yet who would leave them as free as eccentric lapwings zigzagging cunningly across the fields, to pursue their devious courses. Each would like that in the other, yet each is possessive, jealously watchful, proud and egoistic, and profoundly apprehensive of isolation. Therefore, most people in the state of matrimony inhibit the adventurous sex desire, and make a moral sanction of everyone else doing the same, and in its place they build up thousands of small interests—institutions, clubs, business enterprises.

And so, at last, docilely enshrined in his little heated boxes of rooms he sits—the proud animal man—helplessly pinioned between his own opposing desires. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that most monogamous marriages are compromises based upon mutual illusion, and maintained by fear. This does not mean that there may not be, and are not, enduring and beautiful companionships between men and women, companionships springing shyly from compatibility, and flowering in a thousand shared perceptions, companionships that weather every storm, and emerge mellow and tough in old age, friendships subtle, delicate, intellectually fecund and mature, that scorn the exclusive and sentimental, and ask only a certain speculative attitude toward life, combined with a reasonable honesty toward each other. Yet even with such an adjustment the breathless thrill of the age-old lust for conquest has with many poignant rites been left far behind with the illusions of youth, and at the best, it is but a genial compromise that has been achieved.

ALYSE GREGORY.

Russia—1923

III. Industry

AGRICULTURE is of dominant importance in Russia; its productivity is the real motive power in the economic life of the country. Furthermore, exports of Russian grain might at any time profoundly influence Europe's economic equilibrium.

In spite of this fact the attention of the Soviet government has until very recently been chiefly turned upon industry—largely because the workers formed a majority of the Bolshevik party's supporters. Nationalized industry, under the administration of the Supreme Council for National Economy and its delegates, has provided the experimental field in which the Communist theories have been carried out.

That the country has emerged from these experiments impoverished and disorganized is common knowledge. But that the Great War and the civil war had already dealt it a severe blow must not be forgotten. Production throughout Russian industry declined with an uncanny rapidity from the end of 1917 until the beginning of 1921 when the "new economic policy" was adopted. In the spring of 1921, it began to rise again in marked degree.

Although on the whole Russian industry is improving, the improvement is not uniform throughout its different branches. The lighter industries

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which manufacture goods that find a ready sale on the market are recovering much more rapidly than the heavy industries, and the recovery of the latter is in my opinion quite impossible without the aid of foreign capital.

The new economic policy, adopted in the spring of 1921, sanctioned the organization of industry on a commercial basis. The smaller industries were turned over entirely to private enterprise, while industries of medium size remained partially nationalized and were leased in part to cooperative societies and private individuals. The state retained control of the large industries, which were grouped in trusts, concentrating under one management a number of similar undertakings.

This new policy forthwith stimulated the production of articles which are in demand among the peasants, especially since the harvest of 1922 which gave the land workers some means for purchasing. There was an increased production of cotton yarn between October 1921 and 1922, which continued during the three last months of the year, when, according to a report just sent me by the Council of National Economy, the spinners manufactured 1,053,000 poods as against 333,000 poods in the corresponding period of 1921. The improvement is still more noticeable in the manufacture of common textile materials where it has risen from 130 million arschins (1 arschin = 28 inches) in 1920-21 to 446 millions in 1921-22, this being an increase of 243 percent.

The rubber industry has increased four and one half times as compared with 1920, and has reached a production of over one third the pre-war production.

The electro-technical industry, which produced to a value of 5,034,000 gold roubles in 1920, declined in 1920-21 to 4,816,000 gold roubles but soon registered a rapid advance. In 1921-22 it manufactured articles (including 2 million filament lamps) to the value of 11,938,000 gold roubles, and its production for the last three months of 1922 shows that the upward curve continues (6,122,000 gold roubles as against 3,689,000 in the corresponding period of 1921).

Russia's Diminished Purchasing Power

But despite this tremendous increase in production, Russian industry is passing at this moment through a crisis in distribution due to the population's diminished purchasing power. At the beginning of the working year 1921-22 manufactured goods were selling at considerably below the cost of production, because on the one hand the production costs were excessively high, and on the other hand the famine had sent up the prices of the chief cereals to a very high level. Textiles suffered especially from the fluctuating values of foodstuffs and other goods, but even the food industry itself was unfavorably affected.

In spite of the inadequacy of the credit at the disposal of the state, the agricultural implement industry succeeded in carrying out, between October 1, 1921, and October 1, 1922, 58.8 percent of its program. It manufactured, for instance, 40,277 iron ploughs, nearly a million scythes, and 700,000 sickles, and its output attained a value of 5,568,000 gold roubles, as against 3,125,000 in 1921. This is nearly twice what it produced in 1920, although it does not yet amount to more than a tenth of the pre-war manufacture.

Despite the urgent need for agricultural implements and machines throughout the country, a large supply of these commodities is actually, for lack of purchasers, still in storage in the state warehouses. The peasants are too poor to buy, and the industrial trusts, which have scarcely any working capital, are not able to supply these implements on credit.

According to M. Lejava, president of the Commission for Home Trade, the difficulty Russian farmers have in replacing their implements has made them particularly economical. Formerly a peasant would buy a scythe every year, or every other year; now he makes it last three or four years. But it is obvious that this does not solve his problem.

"Capital alone," declared M. Lejava, "will enable the factories to resume production and to sell at a moderate profit. They ought moreover to be so well funded that they could allow buyers to make the payment for their goods in instalments."

Conditions in the Donetz Coal Fields

Since the light industries which have shown so decided an improvement are ultimately dependent on so-called heavy industries, the general industrial situation is still precarious. In the Donetz coal fields the crisis arising year after year when the harvest draws the workmen to the villages had less influence on the output last summer than in 1921, thanks to the increased productivity of the miners who remained at work. But the improvement during autumn and winter was less marked than in the previous year, and it is probable that the results of the working-year 1922-23 will not be anything to boast of. The workmen have been badly paid up to the present time, and the working costs have continued high.

A commission sent to Donetz in September last to study the cost of production of fuel came to the conclusion that this was on an average 16.9 kopeks in gold per pood, but that it reached 39.61 kopeks in August at the time when the output was lowest. The amortization of plant amounted on an average to a third of the production price, which proves that a proportionate reduction of the working expenses will not be possible unless the output is considerably increased. But for that capital is necessary.

But it is the metal industry which causes the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Supreme Council of National Economy most anxiety. The production of cast iron, for instance, was in 1921 to 1922 only 3.9 percent of what it had been before the war, and the production of steel in Martin smelting furnaces was only 7 percent. It is true that the situation is improving slightly. During the last three months of 1922, for instance, the production of cast iron increased 37 percent on what it was in the corresponding period of 1921, being 57,200 tons instead of 41,000 tons.

These few figures are sufficient to show that lack of capital renders the increase of production exceedingly difficult, and that the new economic policy has nevertheless brought about a notable improvement. To replace or repair the worn-out machinery, to buy in time the necessary raw materials, and to be able to give credit to Russian buyers, impoverished by the war and the revolution, Russia's industry needs foreign help. I am aware that those who have previously invested money in Russia have no great confidence in the present administration, and I also know that several foreign governments claim payment of the money owed them by the Tsar's government. It is not my intention to discuss these claims or to offer advice to the Russian government. I want merely to express a hope that both sides will endeavor to find a solution which will make it possible for them to resume work together. If this does not come about, I am very much afraid that Russia will require a long time to recover—and her prosperity is vital to the restoration of sound economic relations in Europe and the world at large.

I have been struck by the energetic and serious efforts which Russia is making to reorganize her industry. The disorder and anarchy which prevailed at the beginning of the revolution have been left far behind; the real danger now is rather bureaucracy than lack of discipline.

FRIDTJOF NANSEN.

[This is the third of a series of articles by Dr. Nansen on present conditions in Russia. The fourth will appear in an early issue.—THE EDITORS.]

CORRESPONDENCE

[The New Republic welcomes communications from its readers in regard to subjects of current interest, and especially concerning articles which have appeared in its columns. Those of 300 words or less are necessarily more available for publication than longer letters.]

Pro-French Textbooks

SIR: Attention has been called through your columns to the patriotic sins of Lavisse in his history texts for French schools. Permit me to point out another phase of the same story. Chardenal's Complete French Course (Allyn and Bacon) is a first grammar and reader for French classes in this country. The new and revised edition, copyrighted 1920, has been prepared by Maro S. Brooks. At the end of this book the student is offered "Additional Selections for Readings," composed of "up-to-date" materials. About twenty pages are given to such topics as La Statue "Quand même," La Statue de Strasbourg, Versailles, and the greatest gem of all, L'Alsace-Lorraine. These readings might have been added by Poincaré as far as their chauvinism and militarism are concerned. Germany, we are told in sentences of ringing bombast, was the sole author of the war. June 28, 1919, the date of the signing of the Versailles document, receives a mystic retributive significance, because on June 28, 1519, Charles V was elected Emperor. It was the Empire of Charles V which the Kaiser was trying to revive. The real hero of the world and of France is always the warrior. The sacred places are the victorious battlefields or the peace conferences à la Versailles. . . . . .

It is bad enough to have a Lavisse teach French children patriotic and militaristic history, but why should American students of French be asked to read such absurdities? Of course, to the devotee of the patriotic religion in all countries "our side is always right," but then it is at least fair to ask that each country keep its patriotic priests and dogmas at home.

H. C. ENGELBRECHT.

Bronxville, New York.

Free Speech in 1828

SIR: In 1828 the School Board of Lancaster, Ohio, wrote a letter containing the following:

> "You are welcome to the use of the school house to debate all proper questions in, but such things as railroads and telegraphs are impossibilities and rank infidelity. There is nothing in the Word of God about them. If God had designed that His intelligent creatures should travel at the frightful speed of fifteen miles an hour by steam He would clearly have foretold it through His holy prophets. It is a device of Satan to lead immortal souls down to hell."

Apparently President Walter W. Atwood of Clark University is determined to make a niche for himself in educational history alongside of the learned School Board of Lancaster County, Ohio.

HAROLD L. ICKES.

Chicago, Illinois.

A Belgian Protests

SIR: Ever since reading The Franco-Belgian Formula in your issue of April 25th this article has been on my mind and I cannot help writing you.

The goal that you are aiming at is right: Germany signed the Treaty of Versailles at a time when she knew or felt that she had lost the war; at a time when she wanted, at any price, to prevent the enemy from entering upon her territory; Germany would then have signed anything—and she did sign anything—but now that she is wide awake again, she feels that she finds she has committed herself beyond her possibilities. In this much I quite agree with you.

But what is the good of making Bismarck come out of his tomb, what is the sense of comparing the war of 1870 to that of 1914-18? In 1870 Germany entered upon French territory, Germany was victorious; there was no question then of rehabilitating the devastated territory. All the devastation and all the losses sustained were left for France and besides this she

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had to give up two of her best provinces plus five billion francs, while as a guarantee of the fulfillment of this Treaty, the German army was to remain in France until the whole of the indemnity should be paid.

And now France is the victor, and may dictate her terms to Germany. These terms are copied from those that Germany forced upon her in 1870, but they are heavier because France takes or wants due allowance for the restoration.

But this is the material side of the question and it must be left to the arbiters to find out what France should receive for this restoration and what Germany should pay.

If your article had mentioned nothing but this material question, it would not have disturbed me, for matter is immaterial to me, but when you write that Germany cannot proceed in orderly fashion "with tens of thousands of hostile soldiers billetted upon the population, commandeering whatever goods they please, picking quarrels with the tradesmen, and prepared at any time to blow up the whole industrial machine, if Berlin and Paris fall into a quarrel over technicalities," then I must register a protest.

What proof have you that our soldiers "are billetted upon the population, that they command whatever goods they please, that they pick quarrels with the tradesmen, etc.!" My boy has been a Belgian soldier, he volunteered in 1914 and has made the whole campaign, he was in the occupied territory and I know and am sure of my statement when I say that our soldiers have behaved well, not to say nobly, with the German population. The instructions are to be good to the people, and they are good to them.

My motto, and I dare say the motto of any real human being is"Forget and Forgive." This is the only way to get at a real peace.

EDOURD NYSSENS.

Antwerp, Belgium.

Hop In, Noble

SIR: I have just read Robert Littell's article on the Shriners with great delight. The antics of these "Men about Main Street" have for a long time amused me, and as I have followed the reports of their recent stampede to Washington, I have wished for the ability to express this amusement, as Mr. Littell has so ably done.

However, is it not possible that those of us who deride these sportive Babbitts are doing them an injustice? We complain of the Babbitt; of his circumscribed Main Street existence; of his limited view of the world; of the gray pall upon his mind which makes his whole life a single series of Boomings and Boostings for his own particular Podunk. We complain that he has nothing of the aesthetic in his makeup. Yet is he not struggling to break away from the confines of his humdrum world; is he not struggling to give his aesthetic sense expression by wearing his ludicrous Saracen bloomers and proudly taking part in the conclaves of the Order of the Mystic Shrine? Not by any means would I call this aesthetic, but it seems to be the futile gropings and strivings of the Babbitts to get away from Main Street. The gentlemen of the "Oriental Rompers" are extremely funny, but are they not to be pitied rather than scorned?

Delaware, Ohio. HAROLD J. NOBLE.

Solving the U. S. Supreme Court Problem

SIR: A certain U. S. Attorney has been asked to prosecute three U. S. Circuit judges for conspiring to make a deliberately false report of facts and law and to defraud the United States of its right to their services in making a true report. Their fraud is indisputably proved by records. Their motive was to shield a rich criminal and to rob the poor. In order that the federal judiciary may be supervised by a high tribunal elected indirectly by the people, which will stop crime and tyranny on the bench, I suggest this amendment to the U. S. Constitution:

> "There shall be a supreme tribunal of appeals, to be composed of not less than 5 nor more than 13 members of Congress. The Senate and House of Representatives shall, each, appoint an equal number of said tribunal's members and the President shall appoint an odd member. It shall have such jurisdiction over appeals from the Supreme Court as Congress may provide. It may try and dismiss any federal judge for any unfitness to hold office, and may order the arrest of any federal judge for trial before any court, state or federal."

Detroit, Michigan. CASSANDRA.

The Community Chest Movement

SIR: To any one intimately familiar with the virtues and faults of the Community Chest movement, either as an advocate or an antagonist, Mr. Rhys's article in your May 16th issue must appear clever but superficial.

Clever, because the stock arguments against the Chest as an efficient money-raising machine are presented with almost convincing plausibility. Superficial, because of his casual assumption that "the difference between the contributions of the well-to-do before and after the installation of the Chest" shows a reduction.

Even without troubling to make a scientific examination of the facts, Mr. Rhys might have convinced himself of the unsoundness of his assumption "by the use of logic's priceless gift." Obviously so efficient a money-raising machine would not overlook so compelling an argument to force an increased contribution as that "a man whose habitual contributions to ten organizations have averaged $1,000 apiece each year "by subscribing only $7,500 to the Chest, is reducing his customary donation by the price of an automobile."

Seeking facts on which to base just this argument, the Community Chest officials of Bridgeport, the year after the Chest was formed, discovered only one person out of those who had previously contributed substantially to individual organizations, who had contributed less to the Chest than the sum of his customary gifts to the various organizations separately. A forceful solicitor armed with this information was readily able to secure an increased donation.

However, it is not my desire merely to point out the superficiality of Mr. Rhys's article. The fundamental argument for the Community Chest has entirely missed him. In assuming, contrary to the facts, that the Chest "shifts the burden of financing social work from the wealthy who can best afford it to the many who cannot," Mr Rhys sees only two groups: the wealthy few who formerly supported social work and the "department store clerks, coal yard employees, street-car conductors, policemen, school teachers and others of humble means" who, according to Mr. Rhys, are coerced into giving more than they can afford. In some Chest cities this latter group now bear one-fifth of the financial burden and constitute four-fifths of the number of givers. But the real contribution of the Community Chest movement to the development of social work in this country is in its effect on that great middle group who are neither poor nor extremely wealthy and who had previously given nothing or only a dollar or two to the support of their social agencies. It is chiefly from this group that the increased funds are coming. As they are gradually being educated or, according to Mr. Rhys, "coerced," into assuming their proper share of this community responsibility, there cannot but be a correspondingly gradual increase in their interest in social service matters. The greatest value of the Community Chest is that it "broadens the base of social work."

CLARENCE KING.

Bridgeport, Connecticut.

Hard to Resist

SIR: We are three young college women who wish to earn some money during our summer vacation. Our plan is to "hitch-hike" to the Pacific Coast and back, and we are sure that the trip would give us many opportunities to boost your periodical.

As a suggestion, each of us might wear a placard advertising your paper. Such publicity would undoubtedly produce results, for it is a quite well-known psychological fact that things are remembered when they are isolated or presented under unusual circumstances. What could be more effective in bringing your paper to the attention of tourists on the main roads of the United States than this method? G. J. S.

Brooklyn, New York.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Five Poems by Siegfried Sassoon

Solar Eclipse

Observe these blue solemnities of sky
Offering for the academes of after-ages
A mythologic welkin freaked with white!

Listen! one tiny trickling rivulet
Accentuates the super-sultry stillness
That drones on ripening landscapes which imply
Serene Parnassus plagued with ambrous goats . . .

. . .

Far down the vale Apollo has pursued
The noon-bedazzled nymph whose hunted heart
Holds but the trampling panic whence it fled.
And now the heavens are piled with darkening trouble.
And countermarch of clouds that troop intent
Fire-crested into conflict.
Daphne turns
At the wood's edge in bronze and olive gloom:
Sickness assails the sun, whose blazing disc
Dwindles: the Eden of those auburn slopes
Lours in the tarnished copper of eclipse.

Yet virgin, in her god-impelled approach
To Graeco-Roman ravishment she waits
While the unsated python slides to crush
Her lust-eluding fleetness. Envious Jove
Rumbles Olympus. All the classic world
Leans breathless toward the legend she creates.

From thunderous vapors smites the immortal beam . . .
Then crowned with fangs of foliage, flames the god.
Apollo! . . . Up the autumn valley echoes
A hollow shout from nowhere. Daphne's limbs
Lapse into laureldom: green-shadowed flesh
Writhes arborescent: glamor obscures her gaze
With blind and bossed distortion. She escapes.

Fête Galante

Aubades awake, the crownless Queen of France
Whose nymphs and swains, in gallant guise attending,
From rose-entangled arches now advance
To greet her face through May-Day beams descending,
Flung garlands, outward curving, fall to mark
Her petal-flattered progress down the park,
Where trim bird-choristers in flight deploy
With festive twitterings of Arcadian joy.

Unfolding vistas, vale and glinting spire
With ample distance, liberate, and with art
Of arbored foreground captivate desire
That wantons in the hey-day of her heart.

Toward the swan-sentinelled lustre of the lake
With ushering silks proceeds her ribboned rout.
To Cythera! . . . Obsequious echoes wake;
And the plump roebuck hears the sylvan shout.
The Queen sets out for Cytherea . . . How gladly
Her music takes the water, charms the breeze,
And fades between proud woodlands. . . . Watteau sees
Autumnal ruin tarnishing the scene;
Sighs. And begins his masterpiece half-sadly,
Painting The Embarkation of the Queen.

Clavichord Recital

Mute were the neighboring nightingales
When Orpheus touched his clavichord . . .
Then up the glades of Tempe came
Lulled fleets of moths on moonlit sails;
And glow-worms marched the twinkling sward,
Candling cold dews with festal flame.

Blind sentinels, the good brown snails
Held out their horns—each horn a sword
To fence the enchanting clavichord
From tigers, harpies, fiends and snakes.

Last (to a sixteenth-century air)
One face adrift came dreaming there . . .
'Twas Herrick's Julia! From the brake
She stole with starlight in her hair.

Vigil

Now, when we have been apart so many days
And you are drawing near me, hour by hour,
With unimagined hopes I hymn your praise.

Waiting you in my thoughts' high lonely tower
That looks on star-lit hushed Elysian gloom,
I know your advent certain as the flower
Of daybreak that on breathless vales shall bloom.

O never hasten now, for time's all sweet,
And you are clad in the garment of my dreams:
Led by the heart's enchanted cry, your feet
Move with the murmur of forest-wandering streams
Through earth's adoring darkness to discover
The Paradise of your imperfect lover.

Martyrdom

Since thought is life, God's martyrdoms were good,
And saints are trumps, no matter what they did.
Therefore I celebrate Sebastian's blood,
And glory with Lorenzo on his grid
And likewise with all victims, bruised by boulders,
Stabbed with sadistic swords, on pikes impaled,
Who propped their Paradise on bleeding shoulders
And bred tumultuous pomps when princes failed.

They died for gentle Jesus and His dreamed
Utopia. From a crooked Roman cross,
Heavenward through crimson clouds their conquest streamed
To touch His lips in everlasting love.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Harvard Dead

Memoirs of the Harvard Dead in the War against Germany, by M. A. DeWolfe Howe, Volume III. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. $5.00.

THE third volume of the memorial of Harvard University to its sons who fell in the war gives brief sketches of the careers of seventy-five men who died between April 7, and August 4, 1918. The two earlier volumes dealt largely with those who were drawn by special sympathy with the Allied cause into action, either as combatants or non-combatants, before the United States entered the war. The names recorded in this volume represent more nearly the life of a single college generation. The classes from 1912 on are largely represented; twenty-one of the seventy-five were in the University at the time of their enlistment, and fourteen had just left it with the class of 1916. As in life, so in death they were not divided. The greater number of these star-bearers fell in the first days of Allied success, after July 12, 1918, and particularly in the offensive which Marshal Foch set in motion on July 18th. Seven fell on that day, seven on July 19th, five on July 20th. As Gettysburg and Antietam are the names which we read most often on the tablets of Memorial Hall, so in this memorial are Château-Thierry and Belleau Wood. This third volume is therefore more homogeneous than its predecessors, and more typical of the spirit and attitude of American youth called to give their lives in the service of their country. The sketches vary greatly in length; some are brief as the academic vita; others are extended by letters and testimony to become genuine character studies. The difference lies in the material furnished the editor, but it may be said that none is without the touch of personality, and all are marked by simplicity and genuineness. It is a noble record of which Harvard will be forever proud.

As one turns these pages certain notes and themes appear again and again. There are persistent qualities which mark these lads—a kind of boyish stoicism, a nonchalance which refuses to suffer or gloom, an inveterate cheerfulness and good humor, a joy in friendship among themselves and in friendliness with their French hosts. Rarely does one meet the ugly face of enmity. Sometimes indeed there is a passage of intellectual candor and indignant protest against the ignoble pretenses and hypocrisies which the leaders thought it necessary to maintain. Philip Washburn Davis, 1908, wrote:

> I am just as much opposed to the German idea and its system, and just as much determined to do my share to overthrow that system even while I admire its effectiveness; but that the Germans are fiends or any different from the men who are fighting on the side of the Allies I cannot see. . . . . Are we a race of babies, of quitters, that we must have our courage buoyed up by false assertions of success? . . . I sometimes think that the Germans will win this war even if they lose. We pretend to be fighting for democracy, but we are adopting all the methods of the so hated Prussian aristocracy.

Of the motives which animated these youths that which appears most frequently is devotion to France, and next to that a feeling of loyalty to democracy and response to a national duty. One repeated characteristic is the eagerness to avoid the safer duties of interpreter or instructor, to stay at the front. One recurring impulse is devotion to the men under their command. "I am asking God to help me use my brain in order to protect my men," wrote Orville Parker Johnson, 1918. There has been much written about the bad relations of officers and men in our army. Against it must be set the constant testimony which this volume offers and which in the aggregate can hardly be dismissed as exaggerated or exceptional. Of George Buchanan Redwood, 1910, it is said: "Every man had a good word for him, and he was not like an officer but more like a friend to them all." Of George William Ryley, 1910: "The men had implicit confidence in him, for he never sent them into a place where he wouldn't go himself." Of Oliver Ames, Jr., 1917: "I don't know how he did it, but that kid made the whole company love him and follow him. Every man knew he'd go to hell for Lieutenant Ames. And we knew he wouldn't want us to do anything he wouldn't do himself."

As one reads of these young lives so suddenly grown into manhood, so full of brightness and generous ardor, so full of beauty and strength, one is forced back upon the dilemma in which Ruskin found himself:

> It is impossible for me to write consistently of war, for the groups of facts which I have gathered about it lead me to two precisely opposite conclusions. . . . . The conviction on which I act is that it causes an incalculable amount of avoidable suffering, and that it ought to cease among Christian nations. But on the other hand, I know certainly that the most beautiful characters yet developed among men have been formed in war.

It is natural to compare these records with those of the Harvard men who fell in the Civil War, contained in the Harvard Memorial Biographies. At first sight one is acutely conscious of the difference between the generations; the men who died in 1861-65 seem more mature, more serious, more consciously uplifted; it is the difference between Lowell's Commemoration Ode or Emerson's quatrains, and Alan Seegar's Rendezous with Death. The descriptions of the fighting of that older day seem as remote as Homeric battles from the cutting realism of the glimpses of modern war in Mr. Howe's volumes. The names in the Memorial Biographies are those of the New England aristocracy; the 117 men seem almost of one family; James Jackson Lowell and Charles Russell Lowell were two of seven cousins who fell. In the third volume of The Harvard Dead the New England type is varied by James Augustin McKenna, Jr., 1909, whose quality is all Celtic, and Ralph Henry Lasser, 1920, whose letters reveal intimately the character of a Jewish son. But in the end one is impressed by a great likeness. President Eliot once spoke of the astonishing changes which he had witnessed at Harvard, and closed by saying that one thing had not changed—the spirit which shone in the faces of the Harvard men of 1917 was the same that he had seen in the faces of his comrades in 1861. No higher tribute can be paid to the Harvard Dead than this of accepting them into the noble company of James and Charles Lowell, of Wilder and Howard Dwight, of Fletcher Webster and Robert Gould Shaw. More than this, what Thomas Wentworth Higginson wrote in his preface to the earlier biographies might with equal justice be asserted by Mr. DeWolfe Howe—

> If there is another inference that may justly be deduced from these pages, it is this: that our system of collegiate education must be on the whole healthy and sound, when it sends forth a race of young men who are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prepared at the most sudden summons, to transfer their energies to a new and alien sphere, and to prove the worth of their training in wholly unexpected applications. So readily have the Harvard graduates done this, and with such noble and unquestioned success, that I do not see how any one can read these memoirs without being left with fresh confidence in our institutions, in the American people, and indeed in human nature itself. Either there was a most rare and exceptional combination in the lives which Harvard University gave to the nation, or else,—if they fairly represent their race and their time—then the work and the traditions of our fathers are safe in the hands of their descendants. The best monument that we can build to these our heroes, is to show that they have renewed our faith and made nobler the years that are to come. R. M. L.

The Two-Dollar Novel

The House of Yost, by Georg Schock. New York: Boni & Liveright. $2.00.

The East Wind, by Hugh MacNair Kahler. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. $2.00.

The Speckled Bird, by Robert Cutler. New York: The Macmillan Company. $2.00.

His Children's Children, by Arthur Train. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.00.

The Seven Ages of Woman, by Compton Mackenzie. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company. $2.00.

An Unknown Quantity, by Gerard Hopkins. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company. $2.00.

The Triumph of the Scarlet Pimpernel, by Baroness Orczy. New York: George H. Doran Company. $1.75.

HE who reads these seven novels is dealing, not with the fine art of literature, but with a manufacture, one of the few still carried on in the private workshop, and with sociological documents. There is a faint odor of art about them, but it is a mere pretense or a vestige of youthful ambitions; the chief interest is the quality of the civilization which pays these mechanical authors in praise and money. Of America the collection of climates and races, the landscape three thousand miles wide, little is written. Of America where a lawless majority makes laws not to enforce but as a means to persecute a minority; where learning is vulgarized and religions are invented, and half-witted Negroes are burned—there is no honest picture, but nevertheless revelation. Here by implication is nature's nobleman, the man with small energetic eyes in a candyish shaven face, and his small-boned talented wife, insatiable and fretful; this is their literature.

The House of Yost at least is not an idyl of Main Street's piazzas. Here is landscape, often sumptuous, and brutish movement, with some interpenetration of the two; passages have beauty. But it is not enough realized. A man gets drunk, for example, that's all there is to it; "what it feels like" or the mystical meaning or morbid motive is not thought of; it is a mere thing on the page like the numeral three. The reader is supposed to know what it means; and, of course, takes this good opportunity not to know anything at all.

The author of The East Wind, a collection of Saturday Evening Post stories, seems earnest; apparently he does not think of himself as treacle in the advertising fly-trap. He also has raw experience in mind, or knows where it is located; industry and sex and death are taken for genuine forces. This extra evaluation of life is not handled by a fine writer; but it does credit to the cunning of the editor of the fly-trap.

In Robert Cutler the prostitution of talent becomes disgusting. By imitation an insult to Mrs. Wharton, The Speckled Bird is meretricious and evil. It points a wavering finger at the shames of mediocrity, the lewd old men around Susanna; a finger which hopes, oh so respectfully, not to indict corruption and gluttony and war-hysteria and hypocrisy. The morals of a money-civilization: "In days gone by, if you didn't like a man at table, you could fight him over it or drink him under it." "Upon her naked flesh she felt the sudden impress of his mouth, the wet film of his thin lips, the sharp tip of his hooked nose. . . . Abigail's quivering finger pointed out the Jew. 'He kissed me!'" The man is put out of the house; and the reader is addressed by the author: "You who are a man of spirit applaud the old Celt's forceful, passionate action. Perhaps his manner was not yours, but you recognize none the less the true spark when you see it fly hot from the anvil. Surely no question can arise of the propriety of his driving the Jew from his presence and excommunicating him from all further social and business intercourse."

Mr. Arthur Train is a well-groomed profiteer in pottage. That for which he has traded his birthright is bright and false, cheerful and hard. It has a special life of its own, divorced from reality, like a side-show monster. The fur and rouge and hootch and taxis, the sweet reek of crowds, the funny-page satire, are remarkably credible; made of revolting components but not displeasing. In this epoch when the mystic is most cynical, and the particular appetites are weak which swept the Elizabethan into brawls and gutters, perhaps no "picture of life" will be made but a cheap one by a hardened professional such as he.

The survey is monotonous; variations not upon one theme, but upon one fault: the evasion of experience. It has two phases: evasion by theory, in conduct and thought (Puritanism), and evasion by inability, through lack of intellectual machinery. The former may characterize the land of the Ku Klux Klan and "Clean Books," the latter is the mark of all bad literature.

England produces a certain type of hack novelist; in this waste, one is thankful if the style resembles the ordinary talk of a decent man. Mr. Compton Mackenzie's inventions are the steps of a prematurely old dancing-master; he has written piquant sentences; now they simper and are slightly redolent of peppermint. The history of a woman, neither an intelligence nor a female animal, but a *gilt and pink idol*—transgressor against the future of civilization. Mr. Gerard Hopkins appears not to be gifted, but his novel is respectable. With no "piercing glances" he also deals with the female transgressor, a woman who lays waste a man's vague talent.

The Baroness Orczy has brought out again her celebrated Pimpernel, a stylish puppet of the French Revolution. Ordinary gim-cracks of historical romance, good shameless rhetoric, feeling in primary colors like paint in tubes, the sum of which is assumed to be life; all the problems of the plot settled on the "day of all days, when tyranny was crushed and men dared to be men again." This is comprehensible: the worship of the anti-self, the super-self; a vicarious share in deeds which entitle a man to other men's praise, to stand on the court-house steps of almost Heaven, before a national convention of friends and relatives and particularly those who have not appreciated one's inner worth, envied and thunderously acclaimed. A misrepresentation of existence, but a kind

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of charity, it serves the poor in heart and ameliorates an intolerable pressure. For the complacent realism of a more prosperous class, of club-women and idlers, no approval is possible. It is materialistic, sweetish, and furtive, a systematic evasion of every type of passion; the dreadful spectacle of a people feasting on the symbol of its own dead body. GLENWAY WESCOTT.

Canada's Constitution

The Constitution of Canada, by W. P. M. Kennedy. New York: Oxford University Press. $9.00.

TO say that Dr. Kennedy has written a valuable book is to do him less than justice; he has written what is likely long to remain the standard introduction to the study of the Canadian constitution. Nor is his work useful to lawyers only. Students of political science will be grateful for an admirable analysis of a unique and supremely interesting type of federalism. They will observe, too, in the fundamental discussion (chap. XXIII) on the nature of Canadian federalism how different are the approaches of the lawyer and the publicist to its examination. In substance there cannot, I think, be any doubt but that Dr. Kennedy is right; but granting the fact that the Canadian constitution is derived from an imperial statute, I venture to believe that more is to be said for Lord Haldane's point of view than he is willing to allow.

Most readers of the book, especially in the United States, will probably find most interest in Dr. Kennedy's discussion of Canada's connection with the empire. Events have strengthened his view that any attempt at the construction of a rigid constitution for the empire would do grave damage to its harmonious development; and the famous commercial treaty with America is interesting evidence of the way in which decentralization has become the chief quality of the imperial relationship. When the war ended, I take it, most of the dominions looked for two things. They desired an increase of status and they demanded a growing share in the making of British foreign policy. The first they have unquestionably gained. In part it is the national result of independent membership in the League of Nations, and in part also the psychological fact that the war crowned their emergence into separate nationhood. I should be dubious, especially in the light of the Graeco-Turkish disclosures, about the second. Indeed, I think it is evident that, sentiment apart, Canada's interest in British policy in the Near East is not very different from that of the United States. It is probable that in the future the imperial relationship would be much more severely strained by war than in the past, unless the independent existence of Great Britain were at stake. For the fact is that the Dominions have now an ethos of their own, with their own complex of interests. In any really effective sense, they are sovereign states; and for Great Britain to involve them in a war which was not immediately compelling on moral grounds (I doubt the existence of such wars) would be to invite the dissolution of the empire. It is this fact of independence which makes it so difficult for Canadians to understand why Americans object to their separate vote in the League. The American habit is to make their country a province of Great Britain. That is a stage of pupillage, as Dr. Kennedy well shows, which has long passed.

I agree with him that for its technical completion two important changes are required. Canada must be able to revise her own constitution without reference to the British Parliament. Even granted that any change for which she wished would be granted as a matter of course, it is an index of unnecessary constitutional inferiority that the change should be made at Westminster instead of Ottawa. It is important, too, as Lord Haldane (now the main influence on the Court) has insisted that the judicial committee should either cease (India and the Crown Colonies apart) to hear imperial appeals, or else be transformed into a really adequate imperial tribunal. Instead of sitting permanently in London with a Canadian judge to give it a Dominion veneer, it might well become a peripatetic court, holding sessions in Ottawa and Melbourne and Capetown, with the judges of the Dominions having a fuller share of representation.

Dr. Kennedy's program does not include any full discussion of what may be termed the dynamics of the Canadian constitution. It would be interesting to know whether the Dominion Senate is really necessary now; it has been, clearly enough, the outstanding institutional failure. Nor can any observer be satisfied with the quality of the federal civil service. There are men, notably Mr. L. Christie and Mr. R. H. Coats, the quality of whose work is equal to the best of our own; but in general the level is low, and it has not advanced very rapidly. I think, further, that investigation in detail of provincial autonomy would hardly discover the creativeness territorial federalism is supposed to imply. The time, in fact, has come for genuine innovation; and I do not believe that it is to be found in terms of geographical administration.

HAROLD J. LASKI.

Shakespeare

Shakespeare, by Raymond M. Alden; Master Spirits of Literature Series. New York: Duffield & Co. $2.50.

THIS is an excellent book, a worthy companion to Professor Grandgent's Dante in the same series. It is admirably planned, lucidly written, and based upon a sane broad scholarship. In it Professor Alden exhibits the same wariness against the traps set by cranks and theorists that he showed in his Variorum edition of the Sonnets. The method is one of extreme simplification and the reader with no special knowledge of the vast subject is not puzzled by digression and discussion of side-issues. On the other hand, the special investigator is able always to recognize Professor Alden's thorough knowledge of the very theories which he leaves to one side of the plain broad path which he has marked out for himself. At times this avoidance leads, I think, to something like injustice towards investigators of a less academic and traditional bias than the author's; notably this is the case with the arresting and ingenious, though often overstrained, scrutiny of the plays which Mr. J. M. Robertson has been conducting for now a good many years; the question of possible indebtedness of Julius Caesar to earlier lost plays is too lightly dismissed. A book about Shakespeare with which another critic should agree in toto is an unrealizable ideal —and perhaps an undesirable one. I find myself challenging some of Professor Alden's opinions: he places All's Well very late chronologically; his judgment of Timon fails to bring into relief the grandeur of the latter part of the play and its close kinship to Lear. On the Sonnets he writes especially well, as was to be expected. The biographical chapter is a succinct statement of what is known, as distinct from what is guessed, about Shakespeare.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The opening chapter, on The Age, is an excellent introduction not only to Shakespeare but to Elizabethan literature in general. The weakness of the book, if there be a weakness, lies in its too chary employment of the materials which historical criticism has made available; there is little attempt to account for the phenomena of the plays —poetic and dramaturgic. On the whole, however, this is the best popular yet scholarly introduction to Shakespeare that I know—less aridly factual than Neilson and Thorndike's Facts about Shakespeare; and though not so eloquent as the late Sir Walter Raleigh's volume in the English Men of Letters Series, more informative than that book.

SAMUEL C. CHEW.

The Hundred and One Harlequins

The Hundred and One Harlequins, by Sacheverell Sitwell. New York: Boni and Liveright. $1.75.

MR. SACHEVERELL SITWELL has an advance recommendation. He belongs to the Wheels group in England, a radical opposition party to the Georgians and the "Squirearchy" which dominates them. But though his latest book presents no lines as bad as the following which appeared in a recent London Mercury:

> Autumn, thou splendor that the year puts on
> To meet death royally, then casts again
> Before its conqueror as in disdain,
> Smiling upon him, winning more than won,

it does not proceed very far in a positive direction. Mr. Sitwell owns a mild degree of humor, satire, and fancy, but almost never exhibits imagination. His perceptions are sometimes keen, as witness "I see no breath upon the window's water" and "a singing shower rides on the breeze, and prints the grass with crystal hoofs," but many pauses intervene in which clichés like "luscious grass," "proud battlements," "far-flung plain," "starry sky," do uninteresting duty as space-fillers. One suspects that he usually invokes the properties of his fancy (his unicorns, his men on stilts, his crystal chariots) to conceal emotional voids, that he has in reality a deficient poetic sensibility, that, as Middleton Murry declared of the Wheels group as a whole, his vice is a false sophistication. What does not play him false is a trained ear, which achieves adroit shifts in rhyme schemes within the single poem or smoothly alternates between rhymed and unrhymed verse within a brief compass.

Mr. T. S. Eliot once wrote of Mr. Sitwell: "We require of him only ten years of toil." The first Serenade in the present volume makes one hope that its author will not disregard this stern injunction. Its delicate music, its subtle theme-development, its elevation above the commonplace by the perfectly adjusted reference to the turtles, its complete netting of a genuine minor emotion, necessitate a full quotation.

> Sigh soft, sigh softly,
> rain-thrilled leaves,
> let not your careless hands
> stem the gold wind!
> Let not your green sleeves
> swim in its breath,
> as water flowing;
> lest your thin hands
> make gurgle down the crystal hills
> the gaudy sun's pavilions
> whence he distils those showered scents
> whose virtue all true turtles croon
> beneath their swaying palaces.
> Sing low, then, turtles,
> Sigh soft, swift wind,
> and fountains, cease your flutings.
> Melulla, now,
> lean on your balcony! look down!
> My strings shall sing.

GORHAM B. MUNSON.

The Neighborhood in Nation-Building, by Robert A. Woods. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. $3.00.

FOR thirty-two years Mr. Woods has been head of a settlement house in the South End, Boston. It is with the wisdom of that experience that he writes this story of an outpost in the tenements.

Mr. Woods's book, to be sure, is a collection of individual papers, most of which have appeared in print before; and consequently some of his ideas repeat themselves a little wearily. But it is a good book, for all that. It has insight and realistic thinking. What interests Mr. Woods is something more substantial than any conventional idea of the young Daniel in a lion's den, the profoundly moral settlement worker employed as a reformer. He is studying the practical means of putting back into the city community that current of confidence and cooperation which it lost under the impact of industrialism. It is a problem, on one side, of breaking social problems into units small enough to be handled decently—on the other, of bringing back through a mist of social superstition the real facts of a complex environment. That is the problem Mr. Woods is studying. And more than studying: *testing.*

C. M.

Contributors

JOHN W. OWENS has for a number of years been a political reporter on the staff of the Baltimore Sun. During the Harding administration he has been attached to the Sun's Washington Bureau.

ERNEST MINOR PATTERSON has recently spent several months studying the fiscal affairs of various European governments, having been granted special privileges for his investigations by the government in question. He is a professor of economics in the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce of the University of Pennsylvania.

ALYSE GREGORY, one of the active leaders of the suffrage movement, lived for some years in Europe and is now writing in New York City.

FRIDTJOF NANSEN was appointed High Commissioner of the Geneva Conference for Relief in Russia, and is head of the League of Nations' Russian Relief.

SIEGFRIED SASSOON is the author of The Daffodil Murderer, The Old Huntsman, Counter Attack and Collected War Poems.

GLENWAY WESCOTT has contributed verse to the Dial, Poetry, and the New Republic.

HAROLD J. LASKI is a professor in London University. He is the author of a number of volumes on political subjects, among them Authority in the Modern State and Foundations of Sovereignty.

SAMUEL C. CHEW is a professor of English at Bryn Mawr and the author of Thomas Hardy, Poet and Novelist.

GORHAM B. MUNSON is one of the editors of the new European literary review Secession and author of Waldo Frank: A Study.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The
Latest Addition to
The International Library of Psychology, Philosophy and Scientific Method

By C. G. JUNG, M.D., Ph.D.

Psychological Types

or, The Psychology of Individuation

"A splendid, a great contribution to psychology. This volume is drastically serious, positive, classic, and yet more than stimulating. Jung has revealed the inner kingdom of the soul marvelously well and has made the signal discovery of the value of fantasy."—*N. Y. Times.* $7.50

Previously Published

THE MISUSE OF MIND By Karin Stephen $2.00	PSYCHOLOGY AND POLITICS By W. H. R. Rivers $3.75	THE MEASUREMENT OF EMOTION By W. Whately Smith $3.50
SCIENTIFIC THOUGHT By C. D. Broad $5.00	CONFLICT AND DREAM By W. H. R. Rivers $3.75	TRACTATUS LOGICO-PHILOSOPHICUS By L. Wittgenstein $3.50

HARCOURT, BRACE & CO., 383 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK

Another Cruise Around the World on the "SAMARIA"
1924
Jan. 26th—June 3rd
Limited to 400 Guests

THE Cunard Liner "Samaria" during our memorable 1923 Jubilee Cruise, proved herself so preeminently suitable in construction, equipment and appointments that we have rechartered her with much gratification.

Cook's 1924 Cruise Around the World will be an epic—a superlative opportunity to all who know that yearning and longing to sail clear around the globe and see the wonders, the mysteries and the splendors of the world we live in.

A superb itinerary under the management of the ONE TRAVEL ORGANIZATION in the World, especially equipped for this kind of work through its unrivalled experience and its chain of permanent offices all along the route.

The renowned CUNARD SERVICE—courteous, competent officers—well-trained stewards—unexcelled cuisine—will again enhance the pleasures of the voyage.

Sailing Eastward from New York
Early Reservations Advisable

THOS. COOK & SON

245 Broadway NEW YORK 561 Fifth Ave.

Boston Philadelphia Chicago San Francisco
Los Angeles Montreal Toronto Vancouver

Brentano's
NEW YORK
5th Ave at 27th ST
Booksellers to the World
Mail · Telephone · Cable · Telegraph
ALL BOOKS
ALL LANGUAGES

EDITOR, young man, A.B. in economics; several years' editorial experience; knows labor problems and statistics, finance, railroads; seeks editorial or publicity position with labor union or similar work with any social-minded organization. Address Box 226, New Republic, 421 West 21st Street, New York City.

THE OJAI VALLEY SCHOOL, OJAI, CAL. (Near Santa Barbara)
An Elementary Boarding and Day School of nine grades only for boys ad girls.
GUDRUN THORNE-THOMSEN, Principal.
EDWARD YEOMANS, Assistant.
Address—Edward Yeomans, Westport Point, Mass.

FOR RENT: From August first attractive five room furnished adobe house near Taos Pueblo. Communicate Mabel Sterne Luhan, Taos, New Mexico.

THAT BOOK YOU WANT!
We have over 1,000,000 (Secondhand and New) on every conceivable subject in stock. On approval. Also Rare Books and Sets of Authors. Catalogues free. Mention requirements. Commissions executed.
FOYLES, 121 Charing Cross Road, London, Eng.

A TRAVEL SERVICE
for
New Republic Readers

IN order to be in a position to extend counsel and assistance to its large travelling public The New Republic has instituted a Readers' Travel Service Department, which is prepared to supply information and data to travellers.

If we don't know, we'll try to find out.

The service of this department is placed at the disposal of New Republic readers in the hope that they will avail themselves of it freely.

So, whether you are planning to travel in the Old World or the New, in this country or another, call upon us to advise with you.

Address:
TRAVEL SERVICE DEPARTMENT
The New Republic, 421 West 21st St., New York City

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED